arXiv:1407.6293v1 [math.AP] 23 Jul 2014

A REGIME OF LINEAR STABILITY FOR THE EINSTEIN-SCALAR FIELD SYSTEM WITH APPLICATIONS TO NONLINEAR BIG BANG FORMATION

IGOR RODNIANSKI* AND JARED SPECK**

ABSTRACT. We linearize the Einstein-scalar field equations, expressed relative to constant mean curvature (CMC)-transported spatial coordinates gauge, around members of the well-known family of Kasner solutions on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{T}^3$. The Kasner solutions model a spatially uniform scalar field evolving in a (generally) spatially anisotropic spacetime that expands towards the future and that has a "Big Bang" singularity at $\{t = 0\}$. We place initial data for the linearized system along $\{t = 1\} \simeq \mathbb{T}^3$ and study the linear solution's behavior in the collapsing direction $t \downarrow 0$. Our main result is the identification of a new form of *approximate L^2 monotonicity* for the linear solutions that holds whenever the background Kasner solution is sufficiently close to the spatially isotropic Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) solution. Using the approximate monotonicity, we derive sharp information about the asymptotic behavior of the linear solution as $t \downarrow 0$. In particular, we show that some of its time-rescaled components converge to regular functions defined along $\{t = 0\}$. In addition, we motivate the preferred direction of the approximate monotonicity by showing that the CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge can be realized as a limiting version of a family of parabolic gauges for the lapse variable. An approximate L^2 monotonicity inequality also holds in the parabolic gauges, but the corresponding parabolic PDEs are locally well-posed only in the collapsing direction.

In the companion article [42], we use the strength of our linear stability results to prove a stable singularity formation result for the nonlinear equations. Specifically, we show that the FLRW solution is globally stable in the collapsing direction $t \downarrow 0$ under small perturbations of its data at $\{t = 1\}$.

Keywords: constant mean curvature, parabolic gauge, spatial harmonic coordinates, stable blow-up, transported spatial coordinates

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) Primary: 35A01; Secondary: 35Q76, 83C05, 83C75, 83F05

July 24, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
1.1. Initial value problem formulation of the Einstein equations and a rough statement of the main results 3
1.2. CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge and the Kasner family 5
1.3. Monotonicity in another context 6
1.4. Paper outline 7
2. Notation and Conventions 7

*Princeton University, Department of Mathematics, Fine Hall, Washington Road, Princeton, NJ 08544-1000, USA. irod@math.princeton.edu.

**Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Mathematics, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Room E18-328, Cambridge, MA 02139-4307, USA. jspeck@math.mit.edu.

* IR gratefully acknowledges support from NSF grant # DMS-1001500.

** JS gratefully acknowledges support from NSF grant # DMS-1162211 and from a Solomon Buchsbaum grant administered by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

2.1. Indices 7
2.2. Spacetime tensorfields and Σ_t−tangent tensorfields 7
2.3. Coordinate systems and differential operators 7
2.4. L^2 norms 8
2.5. Constants 8
3. The Einstein-Scalar Field Equations in CMC-Transported Spatial Coordinates and the Linearized Equations 8
3.1. Preliminary discussion 8
3.2. The Einstein-scalar field equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates 9
3.3. Linearized quantities 10
4. Norms and Energies 12
4.1. Pointwise norms 12
4.2. Sobolev norms 12
4.3. Energies 13
5. The Two Linearized Stability Theorems 14
5.1. Statement of the two theorems 14
5.2. Energy identities verified by solutions to the linearized equations 16
5.3. Proof of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 21
5.4. Comments on realizing “end states” 24
6. Comments on the nonlinear problem 25
7. A Second Proof of Linearized Stability via Parabolic Lapse Gauges 27
7.1. Choice of a gauge and the corresponding formulation of the Einstein-scalar field equations 27
7.2. Linearizing around Kasner 29
7.3. Statement of the main monotonicity theorem 29
7.4. Preliminary estimates and identities towards the proof of Theorem 7.1 31
7.5. Proof of Theorem 7.1 36
Acknowledgments 38
References 38

1. Introduction

In this article, we prove approximate monotonicity and stability results for solutions to linearized versions of the Einstein-scalar field system in $1+3$ dimensions. Relative to an arbitrary coordinate system, the nonlinear equations are (for $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$)

$$\mathbf{Ric}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu}, \tag{1.1a}$$

$$(\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{D}_\alpha\mathbf{D}_\beta\phi = 0, \tag{1.1b}$$

where the spacetime metric $\mathbf{g}$ is Lorentzian and of signature $(-,+,+,+)$, $\mathbf{Ric}$ denotes the Ricci tensor of $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{R}$ denotes the scalar curvature of $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{D}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbf{g}$, and $\mathbf{T}$ denotes the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar-field ϕ:

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{D}_\mu\phi\mathbf{D}_\nu\phi - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{D}_\alpha\phi\mathbf{D}_\beta\phi. \tag{1.2}$$

In addition to deriving stability results for solutions to linearized versions of (1.1a)-(1.1b), we also outline (see Sect. 6) how to use the linear estimates to prove a nonlinear stable singularity formation result; we provide the detailed nonlinear analysis in the companion article [42]. More precisely, as we describe below, in [42], we show the nonlinear stability the well-known Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) solution in a neighborhood of its Big Bang singularity. The approximate monotonicity driving the results of [42] is interesting in itself and moreover, certain aspects of it survive in regimes other than the near-FLRW one; see Sect. 5.2. It is for this reason that we have chosen to isolate the main ideas behind it by studying the linearized equations of the present article. Specifically, in suitable gauges that we describe below, we linearize equations (1.1a)-(1.1b) around members of the well-known Kasner family, which are cosmological solutions[1] of the nonlinear equations. Exceptional cases aside, the Kasner solutions have a Big-Bang singularity along the past boundary $\{t = 0\}$ where their Kretschmann scalar[2] blows up like[3] t^{-4}. For convenience, we restrict our attention to the case in which the Kasner solutions have spacelike Cauchy hypersurfaces diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{T}^3$. We provide the explicit form of the Kasner solutions in Sect. 1.2.

Although some aspects of the approximate monotonicity are present for a large class of Kasner backgrounds, it becomes particularly strong when they are near the spatially isotropic FLRW solution (see (1.11)). Under a near-FLRW Kasner background assumption, we consider "initial" data for the linearized equations given along $\{t = 1\}$ and study the behavior of the linear solutions in the past direction $t \downarrow 0$. In addition to quantifying the approximate monotonicity (see Theorem 5.1), we also extract detailed information about the asymptotics of the linearized solution including showing that certain components converge, *not to* 0, *but rather to a function of the spatial variable* x (see Theorem 5.2 and Sect. 5.4). Our analysis also shows that the linearized solution exhibits *velocity term dominated* (VTD) behavior at the lower derivative levels near the background singularity $\{t = 0\}$. In general relativity, the terminology "VTD behavior" means that the spatial derivative terms in the equations become negligible relative to the time derivative terms near $\{t = 0\}$. This terminology originated in the work [20]. The VTD nature of our

[1] By "cosmological," we mean that the spacetime manifold has compact Cauchy hypersurfaces and that the Ricci curvature of the spacetime metric $\mathbf{g}$ verifies $\mathbf{Ric}_{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{X}^\alpha\mathbf{X}^\beta \geq 0$ for all timelike vectors $\mathbf{X}^\mu$.

[2] The Kretschmann scalar is $\mathbf{Riem}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\mathbf{Riem}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, where $\mathbf{Riem}$ is the spacetime Riemann curvature tensor.

[3] One can compute that in terms of the Kasner exponents from (1.8), the Kretschmann scalar is equal to $4t^{-4}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^3 q_i^4 + \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 3} q_i^2q_j^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 q_i^2 - 2\sum_{i=1}^3 q_i^3\right\} \geq 4t^{-4}\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 3} q_i^2q_j^2$.

linearized solutions is not just a curiosity; it plays a key role in controlling error terms in the nonlinear problem, as we describe in Sect. 6.

It is the combined strength of the estimates provided by Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 that allows us to prove that the FLRW solution is nonlinearly stable in the collapsing direction (towards the Big Bang). More precisely, in the companion article [42], we prove that if we perturb[4] (without symmetry assumptions) the FLRW "data" at $\{t = 1\}$, then we can solve the Einstein-scalar field equations in the past direction all the way down to $\{t = 0\}$, where a Big Bang singularity occurs and the Kretschmann scalar blows up like t^{-4}. Actually, we prove the result for a more complicated kind of matter known as the *stiff fluid*,[5] which reduces to the scalar field model when the vorticity vanishes. As we explain below, the proof in [42] is based on a formulation of the equations relative to constant mean curvature (CMC from now on)-transported spatial coordinates. For this reason, in the present article, we use the same coordinates in formulating the nonlinear equations. In particular, we study linearized versions of precisely this formulation of the nonlinear equations.

Consistent with our proof of nonlinear stable blow-up in [42], we could also extend our linear stability results to apply when the background solutions are near-FLRW as measured by a Sobolev norm (and hence are spatially dependent). We do not provide such an extension here because it would significantly lengthen the paper without contributing substantially to the main ideas. A related feature of the result [42] is that we are able derive the main aspects of stable singularity formation without knowing the precise end state; it suffices to control the difference between the perturbed solution and the FLRW solution, and moreover, our proof would go through if we instead controlled the difference between the perturbed solution and any near-FLRW Kasner solution.

Previous work has provided related results showing the stability of singular solutions to the Einstein equations in various contexts, but only under under symmetry assumptions that reduce the analysis to $1+1$ dimensional PDEs[6] [17, 31, 40, 41]. There also is a body of work that provides the construction of (but not the stability of) singularity-containing solutions to select nonlinear Einstein-matter systems, but only under the assumption of symmetry [7, 13, 14, 30, 32, 35, 46] and/or spatial analyticity [5, 19]. A related approach to studying Big Bang singularities involves devising a formulation of Einstein's equations that allows one to solve a Cauchy problem with initial data given on the singular hypersurface $\{t = 0\}$ itself;[7] see, for example, [6, 18, 33, 34, 48–50]. In some cases, these works included a proof that the singular solutions exhibit VTD behavior. Readers may consult [37] for a precise comparison of these results as well as an extension of them to prove the existence of singular solutions to the Einstein-vacuum equations with Gowdy symmetry.[8] In contrast to the regular Cauchy problem studied here and in the companion article [42], the above works are based on prescribing the asymptotics as $t \downarrow 0$ and then constructing a solution that achieves these asymptotics by solving a Fuchsian PDE system that is singular at $\{t = 0\}$. The

[4] The perturbations belong to a suitable Sobolev space.

[5] A stiff fluid verifies the equation of state $p = \rho$ and thus has sound speed $\sqrt{dp/d\rho}$ equal to 1.

[6] There also are stable singularity formation results in the class of spatially homogeneous (no spatial dependence) solutions; see [38] or [51] for an overview.

[7] This method is based on formulating the equations in terms of a rescaled metric, conformal to the physical spacetime metric, in such a way that the rescaled metric remains regular throughout the entire evolution. As such, this method can be viewed as an extension of Friedrich's *conformal method* [27, 28].

[8] Gowdy solutions are a subset of the $\mathbb{T}^2-$symmetric solutions characterized by the vanishing of the *twist constants* $(\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\mu'}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}\mathbf{X}^\alpha\mathbf{Y}^\beta\mathbf{D}_{\mu'}\mathbf{X}^\nu$ and $(\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\mu'}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}\mathbf{X}^\alpha\mathbf{Y}^\beta\mathbf{D}_{\mu'}\mathbf{Y}^\nu$, where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is the volume form of $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$ are the Killing fields corresponding to the two symmetries.

Fuchsian PDEs treated in these works are typically of the form

$$t\partial_t u + A(x)u = F(t, x, u, \partial_x u), \tag{1.3}$$

where u is the array of unknowns, A is a matrix, and F is an array, and A and F must verify some technical assumptions.

We anticipate that in 3 spatial dimensions, our linear stability results are highly sensitive to changes in the matter model. As evidence, we consider fluids verifying the sub-stiff equation of state $p = c_s^2\rho$ with the constant c_s verifying $0 < c_s < 1$. For the Euler-Einstein equations with such fluids, Ringström showed [39] that spatially homogeneous solutions with Bianchi IX symmetry[9] generically (that is, for non-Taub solutions) have limit points in the approach towards the singularity that must be either *vacuum* Bianchi type I (that is, vacuum Kasner), vacuum Bianchi type VII_0, or vacuum Bianchi type II. In particular, Ringström's work showed that a sub-stiff fluid has a negligible effect on Bianchi IX solutions near the singularity. Furthermore, he showed that almost all such solutions are *oscillatory* in the sense that there are at least three distinct limit points, *which stands in stark contrast to the approximately monotonic behavior of our linearized solutions and the nonlinear solutions in* [42].

Belinskii and Khalatnikov [11] were the first to suggest the existence of *non-spatially homogeneous* approximately monotonic singular solutions to the Einstein-scalar field system. In a later article [9], Barrow argued that fluids verifying the equation of state $p = c_s^2\rho$ should induce a similar effect if and only if $c_s = 1$; he referred to the mollifying effect of a stiff fluid as *quiescent cosmology*. The first rigorous construction of such solutions without symmetry was provided by the aforementioned work of Andersson and Rendall [5]. They constructed a family of spatially analytic solutions to the Einstein-scalar field and Einstein-stiff fluid systems that have Big Bang singularities and that feature approximately monotonic behavior. Their proof was based on a two-step process. In the first step, they constructed a family of spatially analytic solutions to the *velocity dominated* equations, which were obtained by throwing away the spatial derivative terms from the Einstein-matter equations.[10] In the second step, they constructed spatially analytic solutions to the Einstein-matter equations by writing the true solution as the velocity dominated solution plus error terms that were shown, by Fuchsian analysis, to go to 0 as $t \downarrow 0$. The results of [5] were extended to higher dimensions and other matter models in [19]. The family of solutions constructed in this fashion is large in the sense that its number of degrees of freedom coincides with the number of free functions in the Einstein initial data. However, since the results are based on prescribing the asymptotics near the Big Bang within the class of spatially analytic solutions, they are not true stable singularity formation results. In particular, the map from the set of spatially analytic asymptotic states of [5] to the set of Cauchy data (say at $t = 1$) might be highly degenerate in the sense that it does not extend to more physically relevant function spaces such as Sobolev spaces. The primary ingredient needed to upgrade the work of Andersson and Rendall to a true stable singularity formation result corresponding to solving a regular Cauchy problem is a suitable statement of linearized stability, strong enough to control the nonlinear terms. This is what our linearized stability theorems provide in the near-FLRW case.

1.1. **Initial value problem formulation of the Einstein equations and a rough statement of the main results.**

The fundamental result [15] of Choquet-Bruhat showed that the (nonlinear) Einstein-scalar field system (1.1a)-(1.1b) has an initial value problem formulation in which sufficiently regular data give rise

[9] For a precise definition of this symmetry class and the others that we mention below, readers my consult [16]. We mention that the Bianchi classes are spatially homogeneous and hence the corresponding solutions depend only on a time variable.

[10] In [5], the Einstein equations were formulated relative to a Gaussian coordinate system in which the spacetime metric takes the form $\mathbf{g} = -dt^2 + g_{ab}dx^a dx^b$.

to a unique local solution. We now state some basic facts about the initial value problem. The data (for the nonlinear equations) consist of the manifold $\mathbb{T}^3$ equipped with the fields $({}^0g_{ij}, {}^0k_{ij}, {}^0\phi, {}^0\psi)$. Here, ${}^0g_{ij}$ is a Riemannian metric, ${}^0k_{ij}$ is a symmetric two-tensor , and ${}^0\phi$ and ${}^0\psi$ are two functions. A solution launched by the data consists of a four-dimensional time-orientable spacetime[11] $(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu})$, a scalar field ϕ on $\mathbf{M}$, and an embedding $\mathbb{T}^3 \overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} \mathbf{M}$ such that $\iota(\mathbb{T}^3)$ is a Cauchy hypersurface in $(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu})$. The spacetime fields must verify the equations (1.1a)-(1.1b) and be such that $\iota^*\mathbf{g} = {}^0g$, $\iota^*\mathbf{k} = {}^0k$, $\iota^*\phi = {}^0\phi$, $\iota^*\hat{\mathbf{N}}\phi = {}^0\psi$, where $\mathbf{k}$ is the second fundamental form of $\iota(\mathbb{T}^3)$, $\hat{\mathbf{N}}\phi$ is derivative of ϕ in the direction of the future-directed normal $\hat{\mathbf{N}}$ to $\iota(\mathbb{T}^3)$, and ι^* denotes pullback by ι. Throughout the article, we will often suppress the embedding and identify $\mathbb{T}^3$ with $\iota(\mathbb{T}^3)$.

It is well-known (see also Prop. 3.1) that the data are constrained by the *Gauss* and *Codazzi* equations, which take the following form for the Einstein-scalar field system:

$$ {}^0R - {}^0k^a_{\ b}\,{}^0k^b_{\ a} + ({}^0k^a_{\ a})^2 = 2\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}}, \hat{\mathbf{N}})|_{\mathbb{T}^3} = {}^0\psi^2 + \nabla^{a\,0}\phi\nabla_a\,{}^0\phi, \tag{1.4a} $$

$$ \nabla_a\,{}^0k^a_{\ j} - {}^0\nabla_j\,{}^0k^a_{\ a} = -\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j})|_{\mathbb{T}^3} = -{}^0\psi\nabla_j\,{}^0\phi. \tag{1.4b} $$

Above, $\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}}, \hat{\mathbf{N}}) := \mathbf{T}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{\mathbf{N}}^\alpha\hat{\mathbf{N}}^\beta$, ∇ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of ${}^0g$, ${}^0R$ denotes the scalar curvature of ${}^0g$, and indices are lowered and raised with ${}^0g$ and its inverse. Equations (1.4a)-(1.4b) are sometimes referred to as the *Hamiltonian* and *momentum* constraints.

As is well known, to obtain a hyperbolic formulation, or more generally, elliptic-hyperbolic or parabolic-hyperbolic formulation, of equations (1.1a)-(1.1b), one must impose gauge choices. We find that there are two gauges that allow us to detect the aforementioned monotonicity, which plays a central role in our analysis. The first is the aforementioned CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge, which we recall in detail in Sect. 3. The second is a one-parameter family of gauges that is in many ways like the CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge, except that the elliptic CMC lapse equation is replaced with a parabolic evolution equation for the lapse variable that is well-posed in the past direction; see Sect. 7 for the details. Both of these gauges involve an infinite speed of propagation,[12] which is essential for synchronizing the singularity in the nonlinear problem. To the best of our knowledge, the earliest instance of using a parabolic gauge in general relativity is found in [8], where the authors suggested that parabolic gauges might be useful for studying the long-time behavior of solutions. Readers may also consult [29] for a discussion of local well-posedness for the Einstein equations under various gauge conditions involving a parabolic equation for the lapse.

We now summarize our main results. We provide the detailed statements in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.

Main result 1: Approximate L^2 monotonicity for the linearized equations. Consider a solution to the linearized Einstein-scalar field equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge with data given on $\Sigma_1 := \{1\} \times \mathbb{T}^3$. Specifically, the equations are linearized around a Kasner solution (1.8). There exists an energy $\mathscr{E}_{(Total)}$ that controls $t-$weighted L^2 norms of the linearized solution variables and that verifies the following estimate for $t \in (0, 1]$ whenever $\kappa \geq 0$ is sufficiently small:

$$ \mathscr{E}^2_{(Total)}(t) \leq C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total)}(1) + c\kappa \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1}\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total)}(s)\, ds - \text{Coercive potential terms}. \tag{1.5} $$

[11] $\mathbf{M}$ is a four-dimensional manifold.

[12] The fundamental (gauge-independent) dynamic variables in the Einstein-scalar field equations of course propagate at a finite speed. It is only our description of them that involves an infinite speed.

Above, C and c are positive constants, and κ is the size of the trace-free part of the second fundamental form of Σ_1 (relative to the Kasner solution). Furthermore, the "Coercive potential terms" on the right-hand side of (1.5) are $t-$weighted quadratic spacetime integrals that are *positive definite* in the "potential" components (that is, components not involving time derivatives) of the linearized solution. In addition, we have the following estimate for $t \in (0,1]$:

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total)}(t) \leq C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total)}(1)t^{-c\kappa}. \tag{1.6}$$

Main result 2: Improved behavior for the lower-order derivatives and convergence. Under the above smallness assumption on κ, whenever the data for the linearized equations have higher Sobolev regularity, the below-top-order derivatives of the linearized solution enjoy *less-singular-in t behavior* as $t \downarrow 0$ compared to the behavior allowed by (1.6). Furthermore, for sufficiently regular data, certain time-rescaled components of the linearized solution have a regular, finite, spatially dependent limit as $t \downarrow 0$. Some of these convergent components do not generally decay to 0.

Remark 1.1. Similar results hold in the parabolic lapse gauge mentioned above; see Theorem 7.1 and Remark 7.5.

1.2. **CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge and the Kasner family.** As we mentioned above, the monotonicity is visible upon reformulating equations (1.1a)-(1.1a) relative to CMC-transported spatial coordinates. In this well-known gauge, the spacetime metric $\mathbf{g}$ is decomposed into the *lapse* n and the Riemannian $3-$metric g on $\Sigma_t := \{(s,x) \in (0,1] \times \mathbb{T}^3 \mid s = t\}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{g} = -n^2 dt^2 + g_{ab} dx^a dx^b. \tag{1.7}$$

The spatial coordinates[13] $\{x^a\}_{a=1,2,3}$ are called "transported" because they are constant along the integral curves of the vectorfield $\hat{\mathbf{N}} = n^{-1}\partial_t$, which is the future-directed unit normal to Σ_t. The basic variables to be solved for in the nonlinear equations are g_{ij}, $k_{ij} := -\frac{1}{2}n^{-1}\partial_t g_{ij}$, n, and ϕ. The hypersurfaces Σ_t have constant mean curvature $\frac{1}{3}k^a{}_a$. Here and throughout, $k^i{}_j = g^{ia}k_{aj}$ denotes the (mixed) second fundamental form of the constant-time hypersurface Σ_t. We normalize the time coordinate so that $k^a{}_a(t,x) \equiv -t^{-1}$. See Sect. 3 for a more detailed discussion of this gauge. In particular, we provide the corresponding constraint and evolution equations in Prop. 3.1.

The aforementioned Kasner solutions can be expressed as

$$\mathring{\mathbf{g}} = -dt^2 + \mathring{g}, \qquad \mathring{g} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} t^{2q_i}(dx^i)^2, \qquad \mathring{\phi} = A\ln t, \qquad (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{T}^3, \tag{1.8}$$

where the constants q_i are called the *Kasner exponents* and $A \geq 0$ is a constant denoting the value of $\partial_t\phi$ at $t = 1$. These quantities are constrained by the equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} q_i = 1, \tag{1.9a}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} q_i^2 = 1 - A^2. \tag{1.9b}$$

[13] Technically, the spatial coordinates only locally defined on $\mathbb{T}^3$, even though the coordinate vectorfields ∂_i can be globally defined so as to be smooth.

(1.9a) corresponds to our normalization condition $k^a_{\ a}(t,x) \equiv -t^{-1}$, while (1.9b) is a consequence of $k^a_{\ a}(t,x) = -t^{-1}$ plus the Hamiltonian constraint equation (1.4a). In this article, we only consider Kasner background solutions in which

$$q_i > 0, \qquad (i = 1,2,3). \tag{1.10}$$

It is important to note that it is not possible to have all three $q_i > 0$ in the absence of matter. The FLRW solution is a special case of (1.8) in which all three q_i are equal to $1/3$:

(1.11)

$$\mathbf{g}_{FLRW} = -dt^2 + g_{FLRW}, \qquad g_{FLRW} = t^{2/3}\sum_{i=1}^{3}(dx^i)^2, \qquad \phi_{FLRW} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\ln t, \qquad (t,x) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{T}^3.$$

It is the only spatially isotropic member of the Kasner family (1.8).

In our study of solutions to the linearized equations, an important role is played by the constants $q_{Max} > 0$ and $\kappa \geq 0$ defined by

$$q_{Max} := \max\{q_1, q_2, q_3\}, \tag{1.12a}$$

$$\kappa^2 := \sum_{i=1}^{3} q_i^2 - \frac{1}{3} = \sum_{i=1}^{3}\left(q_i - \frac{1}{3}\right)^2 = \frac{2}{3} - A^2. \tag{1.12b}$$

As we have mentioned, we prove the strongest version of our linearized stability results whenever κ is sufficiently small (and thus all q_i are near $1/3$). The relevance of κ is: for Kasner metrics (1.8), the trace-free part of the second fundamental form $\mathring{k}^i_{\ j}$ of Σ_t (see (3.1)), defined by $\hat{\mathring{k}}^i_{\ j} := \mathring{k}^i_{\ j} - \frac{1}{3}\mathring{k}^a_{\ a} I^i_{\ j} = \mathring{k}^i_{\ j} + \frac{1}{3}t^{-1} I^i_{\ j}$ (where $I^i_{\ j} = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,1)$ denotes the identity transformation), verifies (with $|\hat{\mathring{k}}|^2_{\mathring{g}} := \mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\hat{\mathring{k}}^a_{\ i}\hat{\mathring{k}}^b_{\ j}$)

$$|\hat{\mathring{k}}|_{\mathring{g}} = \kappa t^{-1}. \tag{1.13}$$

Note that the parameter κ drives the possible blow-up rate our L^2–based energies for linearized solutions near $t = 0$; see (1.6) and Theorem 5.1.

1.3. **Monotonicity in another context.** Fisher and Moncrief discovered a form of monotonicity that holds in certain contexts in solutions to the Einstein-vacuum equations. Their monotonicity is rather different than that of the present article. As we describe below, Fisher and Moncrief's monotonic quantity turned out to be useful for proving global stability results in the expanding direction for a class of solutions. Specifically, they found a reduced Hamiltonian description of the Einstein-vacuum flow [21–26] which applied to a family of spacetimes containing CMC hypersurfaces (see also the result [4] of Andersson-Moncrief-Tromba in two spatial dimensions). Moreover, as in the present article, their time function had level sets Σ_t that are CMC hypersurfaces. Their Hamiltonian was the *volume* functional of the Σ_t, and they showed that it is monotonic along the flow of their reduced equations. In [3], Andersson and Moncrief used this monotonicity to prove a future-global existence theorem (in the expanding direction) for perturbations of spatially compact versions of FLRW-like vacuum spacetimes in $1+m$ dimensions for $m \geq 3$. Readers may also consult [26] for the linearized stability analysis and [2, 36] for the case $m = 3$. The background solutions were of the form $-dt^2 + \frac{t^2}{m^2}\gamma$, where the spatial metric γ verifies the Einstein condition $Ric = -\frac{m-1}{m^2}\gamma$, where Ric is the Ricci curvature of γ. In the case $m = 3$, the Einstein condition implies that γ has constant negative sectional curvature. The authors also proved that a rescaled version of the perturbed solution converges to an element of the moduli space of γ. In the case $m = 3$, Mostow's

rigidity theorem implies that the moduli space is trivial and hence the rescaled solution in fact converges to the background solution.

1.4. **Paper outline.**

- In Sect. 2, we introduce some notation and conventions that we use throughout the article.
- In Sect. 3, we provide the Einstein-scalar field equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates. We also linearize the equations around the Kasner family.
- In Sect. 4, we provide the norms and energies that we use in our analysis.
- In Sect. 5, we state and prove our two main theorems showing a strong version of linear stability when the Kasner backgrounds are near-FLRW.
- In Sect. 6, we give a brief outline of the role that the nonlinear estimates play in our proof [42] of the nonlinear stability of the FLRW singularity.
- In Sect. 7, we introduce our family of parabolic lapse gauges and re-derive the linear stability results in these gauges.

2. Notation and Conventions

In this section, we summarize some notation and conventions that we use throughout the article.

2.1. **Indices.** Greek "spacetime" indices $\alpha, \beta, \cdots$ take on the values $0, 1, 2, 3$, while Latin "spatial" indices $a, b, \cdots$ take on the values $1, 2, 3$. Repeated indices are summed over (from 0 to 3 if they are Greek, and from 1 to 3 if they are Latin). When working with the nonlinear equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge or the parabolic lapse gauges, spatial indices are lowered and raised with the Riemannian 3–metric g_{ij} and its inverse g^{ij}. When working with the linearized equations, we will always explicitly raise and lower indices with the background Kasner 3–metric $\mathring{g}_{ij}$ and its inverse $(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}$.

2.2. **Spacetime tensorfields and Σ_t–tangent tensorfields.** We denote spacetime tensorfields $\mathbf{T}_{\nu_1 \cdots \nu_n}{}^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_m}$ in bold font. In the nonlinear equations, we denote the $\mathbf{g}$–orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{T}_{\nu_1 \cdots \nu_n}{}^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_m}$ onto the constant-time hypersurfaces Σ_t in non-bold font: $T_{b_1 \cdots b_n}{}^{a_1 \cdots a_m}$. We also denote general Σ_t–tangent tensorfields in non-bold font.

2.3. **Coordinate systems and differential operators.** We often work in a fixed standard local coordinate system (x^1, x^2, x^3) on $\mathbb{T}^3$. The vectorfields $\partial_j := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ are globally well-defined even though the coordinates themselves are not. Hence, in a slight abuse of notation, we use $\{\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3\}$ to denote the globally defined vectorfield frame. We denote the corresponding dual frame by $\{dx^1, dx^2, dx^3\}$. As we described in Sect. 1.2, the spatial coordinates can be transported along the unit normal to Σ_t, thus producing a local coordinate system (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) on manifolds-with-boundary of the form $(T, 1] \times \mathbb{T}^3$, and we often write t instead of x^0. The corresponding vectorfield frame on $(T, 1] \times \mathbb{T}^3$ is $\{\partial_0, \partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3\}$, and the corresponding dual frame is $\{dx^0, dx^1, dx^2, dx^3\}$. Relative to this frame, the Kasner metrics $\mathring{\mathbf{g}}$ are of the form (1.8). The symbol ∂_μ denotes the frame derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}$, and we often write ∂_t instead of ∂_0 and dt instead of dx^0. Most of our equations and estimates are stated relative to the frame $\left\{\partial_\mu\right\}_{\mu=0,1,2,3}$ and dual frame $\left\{dx^\mu\right\}_{\mu=0,1,2,3}$.

We use the notation ∂f to denote the *spatial coordinate* gradient of the function f. Similarly, if Θ is a Σ_t– tangent one-form, then $\partial\Theta$ denotes the Σ_t–tangent type $\binom{0}{2}$ tensorfield with components $\partial_i \Theta_j$ relative to the frame described above.

If $\vec{I} = (n_1, n_2, n_3)$ is a triple of non-negative integers, then we define the *spatial* multi-index coordinate differential operator $\partial_{\vec{I}}$ by $\partial_{\vec{I}} := \partial_1^{n_1} \partial_2^{n_2} \partial_3^{n_3}$. The notation $|\vec{I}| := n_1 + n_2 + n_3$ denotes the order of $\vec{I}$.

Throughout, $\mathbf{D}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbf{g}$. We write

$$\mathbf{D}_\nu \mathbf{T}_{\nu_1\cdots\nu_n}{}^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_m} = \partial_\nu \mathbf{T}_{\nu_1\cdots\nu_n}{}^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_m} + \sum_{r=1}^{m} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\nu\ \alpha}^{\ \mu_r} \mathbf{T}_{\nu_1\cdots\nu_n}{}^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{r-1}\alpha\mu_{r+1}\cdots\mu_m} - \sum_{r=1}^{n} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\nu\ \nu_r}^{\ \alpha} \mathbf{T}_{\nu_1\cdots\nu_{r-1}\alpha\nu_{r+1}\cdots\nu_n}{}^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_m} \tag{2.1}$$

to denote a component of the covariant derivative of a tensorfield $\mathbf{T}$ (with components $\mathbf{T}_{\nu_1\cdots\nu_n}{}^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_m}$) defined on $\mathbf{M}$. The Christoffel symbols of $\mathbf{g}$, which we denote by $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mu\ \nu}^{\ \alpha}$, are defined by

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mu\ \nu}^{\ \lambda} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\lambda\sigma}\left\{\partial_\mu \mathbf{g}_{\sigma\nu} + \partial_\nu \mathbf{g}_{\mu\sigma} - \partial_\sigma \mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu}\right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

We use similar notation to denote the covariant derivative of a Σ_t–tangent tensorfield T (with components $T_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m}$) with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of the Riemannian metric g. The Christoffel symbols of g, which we denote by $\Gamma_{j\ k}^{\ i}$, are defined by

$$\Gamma_{j\ k}^{\ i} := \frac{1}{2} g^{ia}\left\{\partial_j g_{ak} + \partial_k g_{ja} - \partial_a g_{jk}\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

2.4. L^2 **norms.** All of our Sobolev norms are built out of the (spatial) L^2 norms of scalar quantities (which may be the components of a tensorfield). If f is a function defined on the hypersurface Σ_t, then we define the standard L^2 norm $\|f\|_{L^2}$ over Σ_t as follows:

$$\|f\|_{L^2} = \|f\|_{L^2}(t) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \left|f(t,x^1,x^2,x^3)\right|^2 dx\right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.4}$$

Above, the notation "$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f\, dx$" denotes the integral of f over $\mathbb{T}^3$ with respect to the measure corresponding to the volume form of the *standard Euclidean metric* E on $\mathbb{T}^3$, which has the components $E_{ij} = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,1)$ relative to the coordinate frame described above.

2.5. **Constants.** We use C and c to denote positive numerical constants that are free to vary from line to line. If A and B are two quantities, then we often write

$$A \lesssim B \tag{2.5}$$

to mean that "there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$."

3. The Einstein-Scalar Field Equations in CMC-Transported Spatial Coordinates and the Linearized Equations

In this section, we provide the standard formulation of the Einstein-scalar field equations relative to CMC-transported spatial coordinates. We then linearize the equations around a Kasner solution (1.8).

3.1. **Preliminary discussion.** We begin by stating some basic facts concerning this formulation of the equations. The fundamental unknowns are g, k, n, and ϕ, where g and n are as in (1.7), and k is the second fundamental form of the hypersurfaces Σ_t. More precisely, the Σ_t–tangent type $\binom{0}{2}$ tensorfield k is defined by requiring that following relation holds for all vectorfields X, Y tangent to Σ_t :

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_X \hat{\mathbf{N}}, Y) = -k(X,Y), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathbf{D}$ is the Levi-Civita connection of $\mathbf{g}$ and

$$\hat{\mathbf{N}} := n^{-1}\partial_t \tag{3.2}$$

is the future-directed normal to Σ_t. It is a standard fact that k is symmetric:

$$k(X,Y) = k(Y,X). \tag{3.3}$$

Let ∇ denote the Levi-Civita connection of g. The action of the spacetime connection $\mathbf{D}$ can be decomposed into the action of ∇ and k as follows:

$$\mathbf{D}_X Y = \nabla_X Y - k(X,Y)\hat{\mathbf{N}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark 3.1 (**The mixed form of k verifies equations with a good structure**). When working with the components of k, *we will always write it in the mixed form $k^i{}_j := g^{ia}k_{aj}$ with the first index upstairs and the second one downstairs.* The reason is that the nonlinear evolution and constraint equations verified by the components $k^i{}_j$ have a more favorable structure than the corresponding equations verified by k_{ij}.

3.2. **The Einstein-scalar field equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates.** In the following proposition, we formulate the Einstein-scalar field equations (1.1a)-(1.1b) relative to CMC-transported spatial coordinates.

Proposition 3.1 (**The Einstein-scalar field equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates**). *In CMC-transported spatial coordinates normalized by $k^a{}_a(t,x) \equiv -t^{-1}$, the Einstein-scalar field system consists of the following equations.*

*The **Hamiltonian and momentum constraint equations** verified by $g_{ij}, k^i{}_j$, and ϕ are respectively:*

$$R - k^a{}_b k^b{}_a + \underbrace{(k^a{}_a)^2}_{t^{-2}} = \overbrace{(n^{-1}\partial_t\phi)^2 + g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi}^{2\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}},\hat{\mathbf{N}})}, \tag{3.5a}$$

$$\nabla_a k^a{}_i - \underbrace{\nabla_i k^a{}_a}_{0} = \underbrace{-n^{-1}\partial_t\phi\nabla_i\phi}_{-\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}},\partial_i)}. \tag{3.5b}$$

*The **evolution equations** verified by g_{ij} and $k^i{}_j$ are:*

$$\partial_t g_{ij} = -2n g_{ia} k^a{}_j, \tag{3.6a}$$

$$\partial_t k^i{}_j = -g^{ia}\nabla_a\nabla_j n + n\Big\{ Ric^i{}_j + \underbrace{k^a{}_a}_{-t^{-1}} k^i{}_j \underbrace{-g^{ia}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_j\phi}_{-T^i{}_j + (1/2)I^i{}_j\mathbf{T}} \Big\}, \tag{3.6b}$$

where $R = Ric^a{}_a$ denotes the scalar curvature of g_{ij}, $Ric^i{}_j$ denotes the Ricci curvature of g_{ij} (see (3.17)*), $I^i{}_j = diag(1,1,1)$ denotes the identity transformation, and $\mathbf{T} := (\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{T}_{\alpha\beta}$ denotes the trace of the energy-momentum tensor* (1.2)*.*

*The **volume form factor** $\sqrt{\det g}$ verifies the auxiliary equation*[14]

$$\partial_t \ln\left(t^{-1}\sqrt{\det g}\right) = \frac{n-1}{t}. \tag{3.7}$$

*The **scalar field wave equation** is:*

$$\overbrace{-n^{-1}\partial_t\big(n^{-1}\partial_t\phi\big)}^{-\mathbf{D}_{\hat{\mathbf{N}}}\mathbf{D}_{\hat{\mathbf{N}}}\phi} + g^{ab}\nabla_a\nabla_b\phi = \overbrace{\frac{1}{t}n^{-1}\partial_t\phi}^{-\mathrm{tr}_k\mathbf{D}_{\hat{\mathbf{N}}}\phi} - n^{-1}g^{ab}\nabla_a n\nabla_b\phi. \tag{3.8}$$

[14] This equation, which we do not use in the present article, is implied by (3.6a) and the CMC condition $k^a{}_a = -t^{-1}$.

*The **elliptic lapse equation***[15] *is:*

$$g^{ab}\nabla_a\nabla_b(n-1) = (n-1)\Big\{R + \underbrace{(k^a_{\ a})^2}_{t^{-2}} - g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi\Big\} + R - g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi + \underbrace{(k^a_{\ a})^2 - \partial_t(k^a_{\ a})}_{0}. \tag{3.9}$$

The CMC gauge condition and the constraints (3.5a)-(3.5b) *are preserved by the flow of the remaining equations if they are verified by the data.*

Remark 3.2. In (3.6b) and throughout, $\partial_t k^i_{\ j} := \partial_t(k^i_{\ j})$.

Proof of Prop. 3.1. It is well-known that equations (3.5a)-(3.5b) follow from (1.1a); see, for example, [52, Ch. 10], and note that our k has the opposite sign convention of the one in [52]. It is also well-known that equations (3.6a)-(3.8) follow from (1.1a)-(1.1b); see, for example, [45, Section 6.2] or [47, Section 10 of Chapter 18]. To derive (3.9), we take the trace of (3.6b) and use the CMC condition $k^a_{\ a} = -t^{-1}$. The preservation of the gauge condition and constraints is a standard result that can be derived from a straightforward modification of the argument presented in [1, Theorem 4.2]. □

3.3. **Linearized quantities.** In deriving the L^2 approximate monotonicity, we work with the linearized quantities defined just below in Def. 3.1. In the definition, g denotes the 3 metric from Prop. 3.1, $\mathring{g}$ denotes the 3 metric corresponding to the Kasner solution (1.8), and similarly for the other quantities.

Definition 3.1 (**Linearly small quantities**)**.** We define (for $a, b, i, j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3$)

$$h_{ij} := g_{ij} - \mathring{g}_{ij}, \tag{3.10a}$$

$${}^{(h)}\Gamma^{\ i}_{a\ b} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ic}\left\{\partial_a h_{cb} + \partial_b h_{ac} - \partial_c h_{ab}\right\}, \tag{3.10b}$$

$${}^{(h)}R := -\frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f h_{ab} + (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a{}^{(h)}\Gamma^{\ a}_{e\ f}, \tag{3.10c}$$

$${}^{(h)}Ric^i_{\ j} := -\frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f h_{ja} + \frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_j{}^{(h)}\Gamma^{\ i}_{e\ f} + \frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\mathring{g}_{jb}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a{}^{(h)}\Gamma^{\ b}_{e\ f}, \tag{3.10d}$$

$$K^i_{\ j} := tk^i_{\ j} - t\mathring{k}^i_{\ j}, \tag{3.10e}$$

$$\partial_\alpha\varphi := \partial_\alpha\phi - \partial_\alpha\mathring{\phi}, \tag{3.10f}$$

$$\nu := n - 1. \tag{3.10g}$$

Remark 3.3 (**Justification of Def. 3.1**)**.** The main point is that for solutions to the nonlinear equations that are near the Kasner solution (1.8), all of the quantities defined in Def. 3.1 are linearly small.

It is convenient to work with the following time-rescaled Kasner tensorfields, which have constant-valued components.

[15] Below, when we linearize the equations, we will view $n - 1$ as a linearly small quantity. Hence, we prefer to write (3.9) as an equation in $n - 1$.

Definition 3.2 (Time-rescaled mixed second fundamental form of the Kasner solution). We define (for $i,j = 1,2,3$)

$$\mathring{K}^i{}_j := t\mathring{k}^i{}_j, \tag{3.11a}$$

$$\widehat{\mathring{K}}^i{}_j := t\mathring{k}^i{}_j + \frac{1}{3}I^i{}_j, \tag{3.11b}$$

where $\mathring{k}^i{}_j = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_t \mathring{g}_{aj}$ is the mixed second fundamental form of the Kasner solution (1.8) and $I^i{}_j := \mathrm{diag}(1,1,1)$ is the identity transformation.

Remark 3.4. Above and throughout, $\hat{T}$ denotes the trace-free part of the Σ_t−tangent tenor T. Note that it follows from definition (3.10e) and the CMC condition $k^a{}_a(t,x) \equiv -t^{-1}$ that $K = \hat{K}$.

In the next proposition, we linearize the equations of Prop. 3.1 around a fixed Kasner solution (1.8). That is, we derive equations for the linearly small quantities (h, K, φ, ν) by expanding, in the nonlinear equations of Prop. 3.1, the nonlinear quantities as the corresponding Kasner quantities plus the linearly small quantities of Def. 3.1 and discarding all quadratic and higher-order terms.

Proposition 3.2 (The linearized Einstein-scalar field equations in CMC-transported spatial coordinates). *Consider the equations of Prop. 3.1 linearized around the Kasner solution* (1.8)*. The linearized equations in the unknowns* (h, K, φ, ν) *take the following form (see Def. 3.1 for the definitions of some of the quantities).*

The ***linearized constant mean curvature condition*** *is:*

$$K^a{}_a = 0. \tag{3.12}$$

The ***linearized versions of the Hamiltonian and momentum constraint equations*** (3.5a)-(3.5b) *are:*

$$t^{2(h)}R - 2\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a - 2At\partial_t\varphi + 2A^2\nu = 0, \tag{3.13a}$$

$$\partial_a K^a{}_i = -A\partial_i\varphi - {}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^a{}_b\widehat{\mathring{K}}^b{}_i + {}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^b{}_i\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b, \tag{3.13b}$$

$$(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a K^i{}_b = -A(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_a\varphi - (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^i{}_c\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_b + (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^c{}_b\widehat{\mathring{K}}^i{}_c, \tag{3.13c}$$

where the constant $0 \le A \le \sqrt{2/3}$ *is defined by* (1.9b)*.*

The ***linearized version of the lapse equation*** (3.9) *can be expressed in either of the following two forms:*

$$2At\partial_t\varphi + 2\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a = t^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\nu + (2A^2-1)\nu, \tag{3.14a}$$

$$t^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\nu - \nu = t^{2(h)}R. \tag{3.14b}$$

Equation (3.13a) *can be used to show that* (3.14a) *is equivalent to* (3.14b)*.*

The ***linearized versions of the metric evolution equations*** (3.6a)-(3.6b) *are:*

$$\partial_t h_{ij} = -2t^{-1}\mathring{K}^a{}_j h_{ia} - 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ia}K^a{}_j - 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ia}\mathring{K}^a{}_j\nu, \tag{3.15a}$$

$$\partial_t K^i{}_j = -t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_a\partial_j\nu - t^{-1}\mathring{K}^i{}_j\nu + t^{(h)}Ric^i{}_j. \tag{3.15b}$$

The ***linearized version of the scalar field wave equation*** (3.8) *is:*

$$-\partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi) + t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\varphi = -A\partial_t\nu + At^{-1}\nu. \tag{3.16}$$

Remark 3.5. Equation (3.13b) is the linearized version of $\nabla_a k^a{}_i = -n^{-1}\partial_t\phi\nabla_i\phi$, while equation (3.13c) is the linearized version of $\nabla^a k^i{}_a = -n^{-1}\partial_t\phi\nabla_i\phi$. We use both of these equations when deriving estimates.

Remark 3.6 (**Propagation of L^2 regularity**)**.** In deriving the equations of Prop. 3.2, we have linearized a version of the Einstein-scalar field system written relative to a dynamic system of coordinates that is adapted to the nonlinear flow. It is for this reason that the energy identities for the linearized equations, which we derive below in Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, should be viewed as providing relevant information about the L^2 regularity of the nonlinear solution. In particular, the proofs of these propositions can be modified in a straightforward fashion to yield a coercive energy identity for the nonlinear equations.

Proof of Prop. 3.2. In the equations of Prop. 3.1, we expand the 3 metric g as an order 0 term and a linearly small term as: $g_{ij} = \mathring{g}_{ij} + h_{ij}$, and similarly for $(tk^i{}_j, \phi, n)$. We then discard all quadratic and higher-order terms, which yields the proposition. We remark that it is straightforward to see that in Def. 3.1, ${}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^i{}_b$ is the linearization of the Christoffel symbol $\Gamma_a{}^i{}_b$ (see (2.3)) around the Kasner solution, and similarly for ${}^{(h)}Ric^i{}_j$ and ${}^{(h)}R$. We have obtained latter two linearizations from the standard expression

$$Ric^i{}_j = g^{ic}\partial_a\Gamma_c{}^a{}_j - g^{ic}\partial_c\Gamma_j{}^a{}_a + g^{ic}\Gamma_a{}^a{}_b\Gamma_c{}^b{}_j - g^{ic}\Gamma_c{}^a{}_b\Gamma_a{}^b{}_j \tag{3.17}$$

for the Ricci curvature of g in terms of its Christoffel symbols (2.3) and the definition $R := Ric^a{}_a$. □

4. Norms and Energies

In this short section, we define the norms and energies that play a role in our analysis.

4.1. **Pointwise norms.** We will use the following two norms.

Definition 4.1 (**Pointwise norms**)**.** Let T be a type $\binom{m}{n}$ Σ_t–tangent tensor with components $T_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m}$. Then $|T|_{Frame}$ denotes a norm of the *components* of T :

$$|T|^2_{Frame} := \sum_{a_1=1}^{3}\cdots\sum_{a_m=1}^{3}\sum_{b_1=1}^{3}\sum_{b_n=1}^{3}\left|T_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m}\right|^2. \tag{4.1a}$$

$|T|_{\mathring{g}}$ denotes the $\mathring{g}$–norm of T, where $\mathring{g}$ is the background Kasner metric:

$$|T|^2_{\mathring{g}} := \mathring{g}_{a_1a'_1}\cdots\mathring{g}_{a_ma'_m}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{b_1b'_1}\cdots(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{b_nb'_n}T_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m}T_{b'_1\cdots b'_n}{}^{a'_1\cdots a'_m}. \tag{4.1b}$$

4.2. **Sobolev norms.** We will use the following two Sobolev norms. The norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^M_{\mathring{g}}}$ are "more geometric" and naturally arise in our energy estimates. The norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^M_{Frame}}$ involve components relative to the transported coordinate frame; we use them when we derive improved estimates for the lower-order derivatives of the solution by analyzing their frame components.

Definition 4.2 (**Sobolev norms**)**.** Let T be a type $\binom{m}{n}$ Σ_t–tangent tensor with components $T_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m}$. We define

$$\|T\|_{H^M_{Frame}} = \|T\|_{H^M_{Frame}}(t) := \sum_{|\vec{I}|\leq M}\left\||\partial_{\vec{I}}T(t,\cdot)|_{Frame}\right\|_{L^2}, \tag{4.2a}$$

$$\|T\|_{H^M_{\mathring{g}}} = \|T\|_{H^M_{\mathring{g}}}(t) := \sum_{|\vec{I}|\leq M}\left\||\partial_{\vec{I}}T(t,\cdot)|_{\mathring{g}}\right\|_{L^2}, \tag{4.2b}$$

where $\|f\|_{L^2}$ is defined in (2.4), $\vec{I}$ denotes a spatial coordinate derivative multi-index (see Sect. 2.3), and

$$(\partial_{\vec{I}}T)_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m} := \partial_{\vec{I}}(T_{b_1\cdots b_n}{}^{a_1\cdots a_m}). \tag{4.3}$$

We often use the notation $\|T\|_{L^2}$ in place of $\|T\|_{H^0_{Frame}}$ and the notation $\|T\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}}$ in place of $\|T\|_{H^0_{\mathring{g}}}$.

Definition 4.3 (Solution norms). The specific norms relevant for the solutions of interest are as follows:

$$\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);M}(t) := \|K\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + \|\partial h\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + \|t\partial_t\varphi\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + t^{2/3}\|\partial\varphi\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + \sum_{p=0}^{2} t^{(2/3)p}\|\mathrm{v}\|_{H^{M+p}}. \tag{4.4}$$

4.3. **Energies.** The monotonicity inequalities involve the following energies for the linearized variables.

Definition 4.4 (Energies). For $t \in (0,1]$, we define

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](t) := \int_{\Sigma_t} |K|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{1}{4}|t\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\, dx, \tag{4.5a}$$

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](t) := \int_{\Sigma_t} (t\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |t\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\, dx, \tag{4.5b}$$

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(\partial Lapse)}[\partial\mathrm{v}](t) := \int_{\Sigma_t} |t\partial\mathrm{v}|^2_{\mathring{g}}\, dx, \tag{4.5c}$$

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\mathrm{v}](t) := \int_{\Sigma_t} \mathrm{v}^2\, dx, \tag{4.5d}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\partial\mathrm{v},\mathrm{v}](t) :=\ & \theta\mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](t) + \mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](t)\\ & + \mathscr{E}^2_{(\partial Lapse)}[\partial\mathrm{v}](t) + \mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\mathrm{v}](t).\end{aligned} \tag{4.5e}$$

Above, θ is a small positive constant that we choose below in order to exhibit the desired monotonicity.

We will also use the following up-to-order M energy:

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta;M}(t) := \sum_{|\vec{I}|\le M} \mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta}[\partial_{\vec{I}}K,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}h,\partial_t\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\mathrm{v},\partial_{\vec{I}}\mathrm{v}](t). \tag{4.6}$$

In Lemma 4.3, we compare the strength of the energies to the strength of the norms. The analysis is straightforward and amounts to tracking powers of t. We first provide the following lemma, whose simple proof we omit.

Lemma 4.1 (Basic properties of the spatial part of the Kasner metric). *Let $\kappa \ge 0$ be as defined in* (1.12b). *The components of $\mathring{g}$ and $\mathring{g}^{-1}$ verify the following estimates for $(t,x) \in (0,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$, $(i,j = 1,2,3)$:*

$$|\mathring{g}_{ij}| \le t^{2/3-2\kappa}, \tag{4.7a}$$

$$|(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}| \le t^{-2/3-2\kappa}, \tag{4.7b}$$

where κ is defined in (1.12b).

Furthermore, the 3×3 matrices $\mathring{g}_{ij}$ and $(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}$ have the following positive definiteness properties:

$$t^{2/3+2\kappa}\delta_{ab}X^aX^b \le \mathring{g}_{ab}X^aX^b \le t^{2/3-2\kappa}\delta_{ab}X^aX^b, \qquad \forall X\in\mathbb{R}^3, \tag{4.8a}$$

$$t^{-2/3+2\kappa}\delta^{ab}\xi_a\xi_b \le (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\xi_a\xi_b \le t^{-2/3-2\kappa}\delta^{ab}\xi_a\xi_b, \qquad \forall \xi\in\mathbb{R}^3, \tag{4.8b}$$

where δ_{ab} and δ^{ab} are standard Kronecker deltas.

Furthermore, the Kasner metric $\mathring{g}$ defined in (1.8) *verifies*

$$\partial_t\mathring{g}_{ij} = -2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ia}\mathring{K}^a{}_j, \qquad \partial_t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij} = 2t^{-1}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ja}\mathring{K}^i{}_a, \tag{4.9}$$

where $\mathring{K}^i{}_j = \mathrm{diag}(-q_1,-q_2,-q_3)$.

Before comparing the strength of the energies and the norms, we first provide the following simple elliptic estimate, which allows us to recover estimates for the top-order derivatives of the linearized lapse.

Lemma 4.2 (**Top-order estimate for** ν)**.** *If* ν *verifies equation* (3.14a)*, then the following*[16] *elliptic inequality holds:*

$$t^2\|\partial^2\nu\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}} \lesssim |(2A^2-1)|\|\nu\|_{L^2} + 2A\|t\partial_t\varphi\|_{L^2} + 2|\widehat{\mathring{K}}|_{\mathring{g}}\|K\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}}. \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. We multiply equation (3.14a) by $t^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu$, integrate by parts, and use the Cauchy-Schwarz and arithmetic-geometric mean inequalities as well as the simple estimate $\|(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial^2\nu\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}}$. □

Lemma 4.3 (**Energy-norm comparison lemma**)**.** *Let* $N \geq 0$ *be an integer and let* $\kappa \geq 0$ *be as defined in* (1.12b)*. Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.2, there exist constants*[17] $C, c > 0$ *depending on* θ *such that the following comparison estimates hold for the norm* (4.4) *and the total energy* (4.6) *on the interval* $t \in (0,1]$ *:*

$$\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta;N}(t) \leq Ct^{-c\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(t), \tag{4.11a}$$

$$\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(t) \leq Ct^{-c\kappa}\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta;N}(t). \tag{4.11b}$$

Proof. Lemma 4.3 follows easily from Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 (which allows us to bound the top-order linearized lapse term $t^{4/3}\|\nu\|_{H^{N+2}}$ from (4.4) in terms of the remaining terms), and the definitions of the quantities involved. □

5. The Two Linearized Stability Theorems

In this section, we state and prove our two main theorems, which collectively provide our stability results for solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2.

5.1. **Statement of the two theorems.**

We first state our main approximate L^2 monotonicity theorem.

Theorem 5.1 (**Approximate** L^2 **monotonicity for solutions to the linearized equations**)**.** *There exist a small constant* $\theta_* > 0$ *and constants* $C, c > 0$ *such that if* $\kappa \geq 0$ *is sufficiently small (see definition 1.12b) and* $\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);0}(1) < \infty$ *(see definition* (4.4)*), then solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2 verify the following inequality for* $t \in (0,1]$*, where* $\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta_*}$ *is defined by* (4.5e)*:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\partial\nu,\nu](t) \leq C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\partial\nu,\nu](1)\\ \underbrace{-\frac{1}{6}\theta_*\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\underbrace{-\frac{1}{6}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\\ \underbrace{-\frac{1}{6}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\underbrace{-\frac{1}{2}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\\ \underbrace{+c\kappa\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\partial\nu,\nu](s)\,ds}_{\text{error integral that can create energy growth}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

[16] We note that $\|\partial^2\nu\|^2_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}} = \int_{\Sigma_t}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a\partial_e\nu\partial_b\partial_f\nu\,dx$.

[17] As we have mentioned, C and c are free to vary from line to line.

In addition, if $N \geq 0$ is an integer and $\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) < \infty$ (see definition (4.4)*), then the total energy* (4.6) *verifies the following inequality for $t \in (0,1]$:*

$$\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta_*;N}(t) \leq C\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta_*;N}(1)t^{-c\kappa}. \tag{5.2}$$

Furthermore, if $N \geq 0$ is an integer and $\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) < \infty$, then the total solution norm (4.4) *verifies the following inequality for $t \in (0,1]$:*

$$\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(t) \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-c\kappa}. \tag{5.3}$$

Remark 5.1. Theorem 5.1 should be viewed as relevant for estimating the high derivatives in the nonlinear problem, while Theorem 5.2 should be viewed as relevant for estimating the low derivatives; see Sect. 6.

Remark 5.2. The proof of Theorem 5.1 essentially amounts to combining an intricate collection of integration by parts identities in the right way. Certain aspects of our proof somewhat remind us of arguments used in [10], in which Bartnik gave a new proof of the positive mass theorem of Schoen-Yau [43, 44] and Witten [53]. His proof was simpler than the previous proofs but was valid only under the assumption that the metric is near-Euclidean and required the use of spatial harmonic coordinates. Like our proof, his involved expressing the scalar curvature of the $3-$metric in terms of Christoffel symbols, integrating with respect to the measure corresponding to the Euclidean metric, and absorbing all of the unsigned quadratic terms into favorably signed quadratic terms (whose coefficients happened to be sufficiently large).

The next theorem shows that the lower-order derivatives of the linearized solution enjoy improved estimates in t and that certain components converge as $t \downarrow 0$. As we outline in Sect. 6, the improved behavior is essential for proving the nonlinear stable blow-up results of [42]. The proof of the theorem is based on revisiting the linearized equations and treating them as transport equations at the lower-order levels. Elliptic estimates for the lapse also play a role. The main difficulty is finding a suitable order in which to prove the estimates. In essence, this amounts to finding effective dynamic decoupling in the equations.

Theorem 5.2 (Improved estimates for the lower derivatives and convergence). *There exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that if $N \geq 2$ is an integer, $\|h\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(1), \mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) < \infty$ (see definition* (4.4)*), and $\kappa > 0$ is sufficiently small (see definition 1.12b), then solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2 verify the following estimates for $t \in (0,1]$:*

$$\|\partial_t K\|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-1/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.4a}$$

$$\|K\|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1), \tag{5.4b}$$

$$\|h\|_{L^2_{Frame}} \leq C\left\{\|h\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(1) + \frac{1}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)\right\}t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.4c}$$

$$\|\partial h\|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq \frac{C}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.4d}$$

$$\|\partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi - A\nu)\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-1/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.4e}$$

$$\|t\partial_t\varphi\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1), \tag{5.4f}$$

$$\|\partial\varphi\|_{H^{N-2}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)\left\{1 + |\ln(t)|\right\}, \tag{5.4g}$$

$$\|\nu\|_{H^N} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-c\kappa}, \tag{5.4h}$$

$$\|\nu\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.4i}$$

$$\|\nu\|_{H^{N-2}} \leq \frac{C}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{4/3-c\kappa}. \tag{5.4j}$$

Convergence. *There a exist a symmetric type* $\binom{0}{2}$ *tensorfield* $h_{Bang} \in H^{N-1}_{Frame}(\mathbb{T}^3)$, *a type* $\binom{1}{1}$ *tensorfield* $K_{Bang} \in H^{N-1}_{Frame}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ *verifying* $(K_{Bang})^a_{\ a} \equiv 0$, *and a function* $\Psi_{Bang} \in H^{N-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ *such that*

$$\left\| t^{-2q_j} h_{ij} + 2\ln(t)(K_{Bang})^i_{\ j} - (h_{Bang})_{ij} \right\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \quad (\textit{if } q_i = q_j), \tag{5.5a}$$

$$\left\| t^{-2q_j} h_{ij} + \frac{1}{q_i - q_j} t^{2(q_i-q_j)} (K_{Bang})^i_{\ j} - (h_{Bang})_{ij} \right\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \quad (\textit{if } q_i \neq q_j), \tag{5.5b}$$

$$\| K - K_{Bang} \|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.5c}$$

$$\| t\partial_t \varphi - \Psi_{Bang} \|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \tag{5.5d}$$

$$\| \partial\varphi - \ln(t)\partial\Psi_{Bang} \|_{H^{N-2}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1), \tag{5.5e}$$

and

$$\| h - h(1) \|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1), \tag{5.6a}$$

$$\| K_{Bang} - K(1) \|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1), \tag{5.6b}$$

$$\| \Psi_{Bang} - \partial_t\varphi(1) \|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1). \tag{5.6c}$$

In addition, the same estimates hold in the case $\kappa = 0$ *with all factors* $\frac{1}{\kappa}$ *replaced by* $1 + \ln t$.

- The convergence estimates of Theorem 5.2 are of a hybrid nature and suggest phenomena lying somewhere in between orbital and asymptotic stability; see also Sect. 5.4. For example, (5.5c) shows that the variable K converges (a form of stability), but it does not imply that it decays 0. In fact, one already knows that in the nonlinear problem, perturbations do not generally decay because all members of the Kasner family are solutions.
- The improved behavior in t provided by (5.4a)-(5.4j) is of critical importance in closing the nonlinear problem; see Sect. 6.

5.2. **Energy identities verified by solutions to the linearized equations.** In this section, we derive the energy identities that form the crux the proof of our two main theorems. Unlike the theorems, the propositions proved in this section are valid for the solutions to the linearized equations *independent of the Kasner solution* $\mathring{\mathfrak{g}}$ *around which we linearize*.

The most important ingredient in the proof of Theorem 5.1 is the energy identity provided by the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1 (Energy identity for the linearized scalar field plus bonus control over the linearized lapse). *Solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2 verify the following identity for* $t \in (0,1]$:

$$\begin{aligned}(5.7)\qquad &\int_{\Sigma_t} (t\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |t\partial\varphi|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx + \int_{\Sigma_t} |t\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx + (1-A^2)\int_{\Sigma_t}\nu^2\,dx \\ &= \int_{\Sigma_1} (\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |\partial\varphi|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx + \int_{\Sigma_1} |\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx + (1-A^2)\int_{\Sigma_1}\nu^2\,dx + \int_{\Sigma_1}\mathcal{C}_1(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu)\,dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Sigma_t}\mathcal{C}_1(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu)\,dx \\ &\quad - 2\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial\varphi|_{\mathring{g}}^2 + \mathcal{C}_2(\mathring{K},s\partial\varphi,s\partial\varphi)\,dx\,ds \\ &\quad - \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx\,ds - A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}_1(s\partial\varphi,s\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds \\ &\quad - \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds - \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}_1(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu)\,dx\,ds,\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $0 \le A \le \sqrt{2/3}$ *is defined by* (1.9b) *and*

$$(5.8a)\qquad \mathcal{C}_1(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu) := 2\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a\nu,$$

$$(5.8b)\qquad \mathcal{C}_2(\mathring{K},s\partial\varphi,s\partial\varphi) := s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_b\partial_a\varphi\partial_c\varphi,$$

$$(5.8c)\qquad \mathcal{Q}_1(s\partial\varphi,s\partial\nu) := 2s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\varphi\partial_b\nu.$$

Remark 5.3. The negative definite integrals on the right-hand side of (5.7) encourage some components of the solution to decrease towards the past. *The surprising aspect of* (5.7) *is the presence of the spacetime integrals that are negative definite in* ν *and* $\partial\nu$. In Sect. 7, we show that a version of (5.7) also holds when the CMC gauge is replaced with a parabolic lapse gauge.

Proof of Prop. 5.1. The proof involves combining three integration by parts identities. Throughout, we silently use Lemma 4.1. To obtain the first identity, we multiply both sides of the linearized lapse equation (3.14a) by ν and integrate by parts over $\mathbb{T}^3$ to deduce that

$$(5.9)\qquad 2A\int_{\Sigma_t} t\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx = -\int_{\Sigma_t}|t\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx + (2A^2-1)\int_{\Sigma_t}\nu^2\,dx - 2\int_{\Sigma_t}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a\nu\,dx.$$

The second identity is an energy estimate for the linearized scalar field wave equation. Specifically, we replace t with the integration variable s in equation (3.16), multiply by $-2s\partial_t\varphi$, and integrate by parts over $(s,x) \in [t,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$ (we stress that $t \le 1$) to deduce that the following inequality holds for $t \in (0,1]$:

$$\begin{aligned}(5.10)\qquad \int_{\Sigma_t}(t\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |t\partial\varphi|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx &= \int_{\Sigma_1}(\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |\partial\varphi|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx \\ &\quad - 2\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|_{\mathring{g}}^2 + s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_b\partial_a\varphi\partial_c\varphi\,dx\,ds \\ &\quad - 2A\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu\,dx\,ds + 2A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that equation (3.16) implies the identity

$$(5.11)\qquad t\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu = \partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi\nu) - \frac{1}{2}A\partial_t(\nu^2) - t\nu(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\varphi + At^{-1}\nu^2.$$

To obtain the third identity, we now replace t with the integration variable s in equation (5.11), multiply by $2A$, and integrate by parts over $(s,x) \in [t,1] \times \mathbb{T}^3$ to deduce that

(5.12)
$$\begin{aligned}
-2A \int_{s=t}^{1} \int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu \, dx \, ds = &-2A \int_{\Sigma_1} \partial_t\varphi\nu \, dx + A^2 \int_{\Sigma_1} \nu^2 \, dx \\
&+ 2A \int_{\Sigma_t} t\partial_t\varphi\nu \, dx - A^2 \int_{\Sigma_t} \nu^2 \, dx \\
&- 2A \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} s^2 (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab} \partial_a\varphi\partial_b\nu \, dx \, ds - 2A^2 \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \nu^2 \, dx \, ds \\
= &\int_{\Sigma_1} |\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}} \, dx + (1-A^2) \int_{\Sigma_1} \nu^2 \, dx + 2 \int_{\Sigma_1} \mathring{\widehat{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a \nu \, dx \\
&- \int_{\Sigma_t} |t\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}} \, dx - (1-A^2) \int_{\Sigma_t} \nu^2 \, dx - 2 \int_{\Sigma_t} \mathring{\widehat{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a \nu \, dx \\
&- 2A \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} s^2 (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab} \partial_a\varphi\partial_b\nu \, dx \, ds - 2A^2 \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \nu^2 \, dx \, ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the second equality, we substituted the right-hand side of (5.9) for the integrals $2A \int_{\Sigma_1} \partial_t\varphi\nu \, dx$ and $2A \int_{\Sigma_t} t\partial_t\varphi\nu \, dx$. We now use the identity (5.9) with t replaced by s to substitute for the integral $2A \int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\nu \, dx$ in the last spacetime integral on the right-hand side (5.10). Finally, we substitute the right-hand side of (5.12) for the next-to-last spacetime integral on the right-hand side of (5.10). In total, these steps lead to the identity (5.7).

□

In the next proposition, we derive an energy identity for the linearized metric solution variables.

Proposition 5.2 (**Energy identity for the linearized metric variables**). *Solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2 verify the following identity for* $t \in (0,1]$:

(5.13)
$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Sigma_t} |K|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{1}{4}|t\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} \, dx = &\int_{\Sigma_1} |K|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{1}{4}|\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} \, dx \\
&- \frac{1}{2} \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \mathcal{C}_3(\mathring{K}, s\partial h, s\partial h) \, dx \, ds \\
&+ \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_4(\mathring{\widehat{K}}, K, K) \, dx \, ds + \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_5(\mathring{\widehat{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial h) \, dx \, ds \\
&+ \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_6(\mathring{\widehat{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial\nu) \, dx \, ds + \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_7(\mathring{\widehat{K}}, K, \nu) \, dx \, ds \\
&+ A \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{Q}_2(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\nu) \, dx \, ds - A \int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{Q}_3(s\partial h, s\partial\varphi) \, dx \, ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_3(\mathring{K}, s\partial h, s\partial h) := s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{cf}\mathring{K}^e{}_c\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f h_{bj}, \tag{5.14a}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_4(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, K) := 2\mathring{g}_{ic}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_j K^i{}_a K^j{}_b - 2\mathring{g}_{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ac}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^b{}_c K^i{}_a K^j{}_b, \tag{5.14b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_5(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial h) :=\ & s^2\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_c{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{i\ j}^{\ c\ (h)}\Gamma_{e\ f}^{\ b} - s^2\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_j{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{i\ c}^{\ a\ (h)}\Gamma_{e\ f}^{\ b} \\ & + s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_c{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\ b}^{\ c\ (h)}\Gamma_{e\ f}^{\ b} - s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_b{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\ c}^{\ a\ (h)}\Gamma_{e\ f}^{\ b},\end{aligned} \tag{5.14c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_6(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial\nu) :=\ & 2s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^b{}_i{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\ b}^{\ a}\partial_j\nu - 2s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\ i}^{\ b}\partial_j\nu \\ & + s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\mathring{K}^a{}_j\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f\nu,\end{aligned} \tag{5.14d}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_7(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, \nu) := 2\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_i K^b{}_j\nu, \tag{5.14e}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_2(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\nu) := 2s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\partial_i\varphi\partial_j\nu, \tag{5.14f}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_3(s\partial h, s\partial\varphi) := 2s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef\,(h)}\Gamma_{e\ f}^{\ a}\partial_a\varphi. \tag{5.14g}$$

Remark 5.4 (No need for spatial harmonic coordinates). Prop. 5.2 shows in particular that we can derive energy estimates for the Einstein equations[18] directly in CMC-transported spatial coordinates. Remarkably, we have not seen this observation made in the literature. Previous authors (see, for example, [1]) have instead chosen to impose the spatial harmonic coordinate condition $\Delta_g x^i = 0$ to "reduce" the Ricci tensor R_{ij} of g to an elliptic operator acting on the components g_{ij}. That is, in spatial harmonic coordinates, we have $R_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2}g^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b g_{ij} + f_{ij}(g, \partial g)$, which eliminates the last two products on the right-hand side of (3.10d) and leads to a simpler proof of a basic L^2–type energy identity. In the proof of Prop. 5.2, we handle these two products through a procedure involving integration by parts and the constraint equations. The spatial harmonic coordinate condition, though it may have advantages in certain contexts, introduces additional complications into the analysis. The complications arise from the necessity of including a non-zero "shift vector" X^i in the spacetime metric $\mathbf{g}$: $\mathbf{g} = -n^2dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + X^a dt)(dx^b + X^b dt)$. To enforce the spatial harmonic coordinate condition, the components X^i must verify a system of elliptic PDEs that are coupled to the other solution variables.

Proof of Prop. 5.2. The proof involves combining a collection of integration by parts identities. Throughout, we silently use Lemma 4.1. To begin, we use the evolution equation (3.15b) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t(|K|^2_{\mathring{g}}) =\ & -2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ic}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_j K^i{}_a K^j{}_b + 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ac}\mathring{K}^b{}_c K^i{}_a K^j{}_b \\ & + 2\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}K^a{}_i\left\{-t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{bc}\partial_c\partial_j\nu - t^{-1}\nu\mathring{K}^b{}_j + t^{(h)}Ric^b{}_j\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Note that we can express the first two products on the right-hand side of (5.15) as

$$-2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ic}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\hat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_j K^i{}_a K^j{}_b + 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ac}\hat{\mathring{K}}^b{}_c K^i{}_a K^j{}_b \tag{5.16}$$

because the terms corresponding to the pure trace part of $\mathring{K}$ cancel. Furthermore, using equation (3.12), we can express the second product on the second line of the right-hand side of (5.15) as

$$-2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\mathring{K}^a{}_i K^b{}_j\nu = -2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_i K^b{}_j\nu. \tag{5.17}$$

[18] Though the proposition only addresses the linearized equations, essentially the same argument can be used to derive an energy identity for the nonlinear equations.

Similarly, using the evolution equation (3.15a), we deduce that[19]

(5.18)
$$\frac{1}{4}\partial_t(|t^2\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}) = \frac{1}{2}t|\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} + t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{bc}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\mathring{K}^a{}_c\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f h_{bj} + \frac{1}{2}t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{cf}\mathring{K}^e{}_c\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f h_{bj}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f\left\{-2th_{bc}\mathring{K}^c{}_j - 2t\mathring{g}_{bc}K^c{}_j - 2t\mathring{g}_{bc}\mathring{K}^c{}_j\nu\right\}.$$

For convenience, in the remainder of this proof, we denote terms that can be expressed as perfect spatial derivatives by "$\cdots$." These terms will vanish when we integrate the identities over $\mathbb{T}^3$. First, we use equation (3.13b) and differentiation by parts to express the first product on the second line of the right-hand side of (5.15) as

$$-2t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{bc}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}K^a{}_i\partial_c\partial_j\nu = 2t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\partial_a K^a{}_i\partial_j\nu + \cdots$$
$$= -2At(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\partial_i\varphi\partial_j\nu$$
$$- 2t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij(h)}\Gamma_a{}^a{}_b\widehat{\mathring{K}}^b{}_i\partial_j\nu + 2t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij(h)}\Gamma_a{}^b{}_i\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b\partial_j\nu + \cdots. \tag{5.19}$$

Next, we use equation (3.10d) to express the third product on the second line of the right-hand side of (5.15) as

$$2t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}K^a{}_i{}^{(h)}Ric^b{}_j = -t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}K^a{}_i\partial_e\partial_f h_{ja}$$
$$+ t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}K^a{}_i\partial_j{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f + tK^a{}_b(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f. \tag{5.20}$$

Next, we use differentiation by parts to express the first product on the right-hand side of (5.20) as

$$-t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}K^a{}_i\partial_e\partial_f h_{ja} = t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e K^a{}_i\partial_f h_{ja} + \cdots. \tag{5.21}$$

Next, we use equation (3.13c) and differentiation by parts to express the second product on the right-hand side of (5.20) as

(5.22)
$$t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}K^a{}_i\partial_j{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f = -t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_j K^a{}_i{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f + \cdots$$
$$= At(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a\varphi^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^a{}_f$$
$$+ t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_j{}^{(h)}\Gamma_i{}^a{}_c{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f - t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_c{}^{(h)}\Gamma_i{}^c{}_j{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f + \cdots.$$

Next, we use equation (3.13b) and differentiation by parts to express the third product on the right-hand side of (5.20) as

(5.23)
$$tK^a{}_b(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f = -t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a K^a{}_b{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f + \cdots$$
$$= At(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_b\varphi^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f + t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c{}_b{}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^a{}_c{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f - t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_c{}^{(h)}\Gamma_a{}^c{}_b{}^{(h)}\Gamma_e{}^b{}_f + \cdots.$$

[19] We recall that $|\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} = (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f h_{bj}$.

Combining (5.15)-(5.23) and carrying out straightforward computations, we deduce that

(5.24)

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t(|K|^2_{\mathring{g}}) + \frac{1}{4}\partial_t(t^2|\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}) = {} & \frac{1}{2}t|\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{1}{2}t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{cf}\mathring{K}^{e}{}_{c}\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f h_{bj} \\ & - 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ic}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{c}{}_{j}K^{i}{}_{a}K^{j}{}_{b} + 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ac}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{b}{}_{c}K^{i}{}_{a}K^{j}{}_{b} \\ & + t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{c}{}_{j}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{i\,a\,c}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{e\,f}{}^{b} - t\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{a}{}_{c}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{i\,j}{}^{c\,(h)}\Gamma_{e\,f}{}^{b} \\ & + t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{c}{}_{b}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\,c}{}^{a\,(h)}\Gamma_{e\,f}{}^{b} - t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{a}{}_{c}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\,b}{}^{c\,(h)}\Gamma_{e\,f}{}^{b} \\ & - 2t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{b}{}_{i}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\,b}{}^{a}\partial_j\nu + 2t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{a}{}_{b}{}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\,i}{}^{b}\partial_j\nu - t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\mathring{K}^{a}{}_{j}\partial_e h_{ai}\partial_f\nu \\ & - 2At(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\partial_i\varphi\partial_j\nu - 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^{a}{}_{i}K^{b}{}_{j}\nu + 2At(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_a\varphi^{(h)}\Gamma_{e\,f}{}^{a} + \cdots.\end{aligned}$$

To conclude (5.13), we have only to replace t with the integration variable s in the identity (5.24) and integrate by parts over $(s,x) \in [t,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$ (we stress that $t \le 1$). □

5.3. **Proof of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.** We now prove Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.

5.3.1. *Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Below we will prove that the following two inequalities hold for $t \in (0,1]$:

(5.25)

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](t) + \mathscr{E}^2_{(\partial Lapse)}[\partial\nu](t) + \left(\frac{1}{3} - C\kappa\right)\mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\nu](t) \\ & \le \mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](1) + \mathscr{E}^2_{(\partial Lapse)}[\partial\nu](1) + \left(\frac{1}{3} - C\kappa\right)\mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\nu](1) + \int_{\Sigma_1}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu)\,dx \\ & + \int_{\Sigma_t}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu)\,dx \\ & \underbrace{-\left(\frac{1}{3} - C\kappa\right)\int_{s=t}^{1}s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}} \\ & \underbrace{-\left(\frac{1}{3} - C\kappa\right)\int_{s=t}^{1}s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\underbrace{-\int_{s=t}^{1}s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}} \\ & + 2\int_{s=t}^{1}s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},\nu,K)\,dx\,ds,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(5.26)\quad \mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](t) \leq\ & \mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](1)\\ & \underbrace{-\left(\frac{1}{3}-C\mathsf{\kappa}\right)\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\\ & +\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}(s\partial h, s\partial\varphi)\,dx\,ds+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\mathsf{\nu})\,dx\,ds\\ & +\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial h)\,dx\,ds+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial\mathsf{\nu})\,dx\,ds\\ & +\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, K)\,dx\,ds+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, \mathsf{\nu})\,dx\,ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}(X,Y)$ denotes a non-negative quadratic term that can be pointwise bounded by $\mathcal{Q}(X,Y)\lesssim |X|_{\mathring{g}}|Y|_{\mathring{g}}$, and $\mathcal{C}(X,Y,Z)$ denotes a non-negative cubic term that can be pointwise bounded by $\mathcal{C}(X,Y,Z)\lesssim |X|_{\mathring{g}}|Y|_{\mathring{g}}|Z|_{\mathring{g}}$.

Once we have shown (5.25) and (5.26), in order to prove (5.1), we add inequality (5.25) plus θ times inequality (5.26). If we assume that $\mathsf{\kappa}\geq 0$ is sufficiently small, then we can choose a small constant $\theta=\theta_*$, independent of all small $\mathsf{\kappa}$, such that, by virtue of the Cauchy-Schwarz and the arithmetic-geometric mean inequalities, we can absorb all error integrals into the past-favorably-signed integrals, with the exception of two terms of the form

$$(5.27)\qquad C\mathsf{\kappa}\int_{\Sigma_t}|K|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx,$$

$$(5.28)\qquad c\mathsf{\kappa}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|K|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds.$$

The term (5.28) generates the last error integral on the right-hand side of (5.1). The term (5.27) can be absorbed back into the left-hand side whenever $C\mathsf{\kappa}$ is sufficiently small relative to θ_*, at the expense of increasing the constants C and c on the right-hand side of (5.1). In total, these steps lead to inequality (5.1).

To deduce inequality (5.2), we commute the linearized equations with $\partial_{\vec{I}}$, derive inequality (5.1) for the differentiated linearized variables, and apply Gronwall's inequality to deduce that

$$(5.29)\qquad \mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*}[\partial_{\vec{I}}K,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}h,\partial_t\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\mathsf{\nu},\partial_{\vec{I}}\mathsf{\nu}](t)\leq C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*}[\partial_{\vec{I}}K,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}h,\partial_t\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\mathsf{\nu},\partial_{\vec{I}}\mathsf{\nu}](1)t^{-c\mathsf{\kappa}}.$$

Summing the estimates (5.29) for $|\vec{I}|\leq N$, we arrive at (5.2).

Inequality (5.3) then follows from (5.2) and Lemma 4.3.

It remains for us to prove (5.25) and (5.26). To prove (5.25), we first bound the integrand on the third line of the right-hand side of (5.7) as follows:

$$(5.30)\qquad -2\left\{|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}+\mathcal{C}_2(\mathring{K}, s\partial\varphi, s\partial\varphi)\right\}\leq -2(1-q_{Max})|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\leq -\left(\frac{4}{3}-2\mathsf{\kappa}\right)|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}},$$

an estimate that follows easily from (1.12b) and the fact that the eigenvalues of $\mathring{K}^i{}_j$ are $\geq -q_{Max}\geq -\left\{\frac{1}{3}+\mathsf{\kappa}\right\}$. To estimate the second integral on the fourth line of the right-hand side of (5.7), we bound its integrand in magnitude via the pointwise estimate

$$(5.31)\qquad A\,|\mathcal{Q}_1(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\mathsf{\nu})|\leq |s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}+A^2|s\partial\mathsf{\nu}|^2_{\mathring{g}}\leq |s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}+\frac{2}{3}|s\partial\mathsf{\nu}|^2_{\mathring{g}},$$

where we have used the simple inequality $A \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$. Note that for sufficiently small $\upkappa$, the right-hand of (5.31) side does not fully exhaust the strength of the negative terms provided by the right-hand side of (5.30) and by the integrand $-|s\partial\upnu|^2_{\mathring{g}}$ on the right-hand side of (5.7). The desired inequality (5.25) thus follows easily from (5.7), (5.30), and (5.31).

To prove inequality (5.26), we bound the integrand $-\frac{1}{2}\left\{|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \mathcal{C}_3(\mathring{K}, s\partial h, s\partial h)\right\}$ on the right-hand of (5.13) side via the estimate

$$-\frac{1}{2}\left\{|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \mathcal{C}_3(\mathring{K}, s\partial h, s\partial h)\right\} \leq -\frac{1}{2}(1 - q_{Max})|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} \leq -\left(\frac{1}{3} - \upkappa\right)|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}, \tag{5.32}$$

which follows from the aforementioned fact that the eigenvalues of $\mathring{K}^i{}_j$ are $\geq -\left\{\frac{1}{3} + \upkappa\right\}$. The desired estimate (5.26) now easily follows from (5.13), (5.32), and the simple estimate $A \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ mentioned above. □

5.3.2. *Proof of Theorem 5.2.* We give the proof only in the case $\upkappa > 0$. The case $\upkappa = 0$ can be handled by straightforward modifications of the case $\upkappa > 0$. Throughout the proof, we silently use Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.3, and the t–weights inherent in Def. 4.3.

Proof of (5.4h) **and** (5.4i)**:** We commute equation (3.14b) with $\partial_{\vec{I}}$, multiply by $\partial_{\vec{I}}\upnu$, and integrate by parts over Σ_t to deduce that

$$t\|\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\upnu\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}} + \|\partial_{\vec{I}}\upnu\|_{L^2} \leq Ct^2\|\partial_{\vec{I}}{}^{(h)}R\|_{L^2}. \tag{5.33}$$

From (3.10c) and (5.3), we deduce that whenever $|\vec{I}| \leq N-1$, we have $\|\partial_{\vec{I}}{}^{(h)}R\|_{L^2} \leq Ct^{-4/3-c\upkappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)$. The estimates (5.4h) and (5.4i) now readily follow.

Proof of (5.4a)**:** We first deduce from equation (3.15b) that

$$\|\partial_t K\|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} \leq t^{1/3-c\upkappa}\|\upnu\|_{H^{N+1}_{Frame}} + Ct^{-1}\|\upnu\|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}} + Ct\|{}^{(h)}Ric\|_{H^{N-1}_{Frame}}. \tag{5.34}$$

From (3.10d), (5.3), and (5.4i), we conclude that the right-hand side of (5.34) is $\leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-1/3-c\upkappa}$ as desired.

Proof of (5.4b)**,** (5.5c)**, and** (5.6b)**:** These inequalities are straightforward consequences of inequality (5.4a) and the integrability of the right-hand side of (5.4a) over the interval $t \in (0, 1]$ whenever $\upkappa$ is sufficiently small.

Proof of (5.4c) **and** (5.4d)**:** We give the details only for (5.4c) since the proof of (5.4d) is essentially the same. To proceed, we first use equation (3.15a) to deduce that

$$\partial_t(t^{-2/3}h_{ij}) = -2t^{-1}(t^{-2/3}h_{ia})\hat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_j - 2t^{-5/3}\mathring{g}_{ia}K^a{}_j - 2t^{-5/3}\mathring{g}_{ia}\mathring{K}^a{}_j\upnu. \tag{5.35}$$

From equation (5.35), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_t(t^{-2/3}h)\|_{L^2_{Frame}} \leq{}& Ct^{-1}|\hat{\mathring{K}}|_{Frame}\|t^{-2/3}h\|_{L^2_{Frame}} + Ct^{-5/3}|\mathring{g}|_{Frame}\|K\|_{L^2_{Frame}} \\ &+ Ct^{-5/3}|\mathring{g}|_{Frame}|\mathring{K}|_{Frame}\|\upnu\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

From inequality (5.3), we deduce that the right-hand side of (5.36) is

$$\leq c\upkappa t^{-1}\|t^{-2/3}h\|_{L^2_{Frame}} + C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-1-c\upkappa}.$$

Using this estimate and integrating (5.36) in time, we deduce that

$$t^{-2/3}\|h\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(t) \leq \|h\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(1) + \frac{C}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-c\kappa} + c\kappa\int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1}\left\{s^{-2/3}\|h\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(s)\right\}ds. \tag{5.37}$$

Hence, from (5.37) and Gronwall's inequality in the quantity $\|t^{-2/3}h\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(t)$, we arrive at the desired inequality (5.4c).

Proof of (5.4j)**:** We need only to revisit the proof of (5.4i) and use the fact that the improved estimate (5.4d) allows us to deduce that whenever $|\vec{I}| \leq N-2$, we have $\|\partial_{\vec{I}}{}^{(h)}R\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-2/3-c\kappa}$.

Proof of (5.4e)**:** We first deduce from equation (3.16) that

$$\|\partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi - A\nu)\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq Ct\|(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\varphi\|_{H^{N-1}} + Ct^{-1}\|\nu\|_{H^{N-1}}. \tag{5.38}$$

From (5.3) and (5.4i), we deduce that the right-hand side of (5.38) is $\leq$ the right-hand side of (5.4e) as desired.

Proof of (5.4f)**,** (5.5d)**, and** (5.6c)**:** These inequalities are straightforward consequences of inequality (5.4e), inequality (5.4i), and the integrability of the right-hand side of (5.4e) over the interval $t \in (0,1]$ whenever κ is sufficiently small.

Proof of (5.4g) **and** (5.5e)**:** These inequalities are straightforward consequences of inequality (5.4f), inequality (5.5d), inequality (5.6c), and the integrability of the right-hand side of (5.4f) over the interval $t \in (0,1]$ whenever κ is sufficiently small.

Proof of (5.5a)**,** (5.5b)**, and** (5.6a)**:** Throughout this paragraph, we do not sum over i. Recall that $\mathring{g}_{ii} = t^{2q_i}$, that $\mathring{K}^i{}_i = -q_i$, and that the off-diagonal components of these tensorfields are 0. Multiplying equation (3.15a) by t^{-2q_j}, we deduce the equation $\partial_t(t^{-2q_j}h_{ij}) = -2t^{-1+2(q_i-q_j)}K^i{}_j + 2q_i\delta_{ij}t^{-1}\nu$. From this equation and the estimates (5.4i) and (5.5c), we deduce that

$$\left\|\partial_t\left\{t^{-2q_j}h_{ij} - 2\left(\int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1+2(q_i-q_j)}\,ds\right)(K_{Bang})^i{}_j\right\}\right\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq C\mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1)t^{-1/3-c\kappa}. \tag{5.39}$$

The desired results (5.5a), (5.5b), and (5.6a) follow easily from (5.39), the integrability of the right-hand side of (5.39) over the interval $t \in (0,1]$ whenever κ is sufficiently small, and (5.6b). □

5.4. **Comments on realizing "end states".** The results of Theorem 5.2 show that for some time-rescaled versions of the linearized solution variables, there is a well-defined map from their "initial state" along the initial data hypersurface Σ_1 to their "end state" along Σ_0. For example, the estimate (5.5d) exhibits this fact for $t\partial_t\varphi$, in which case the end state is Ψ_{Bang} and the map is from H^N to H^{N-1}. It is natural to wonder whether or not one can realize a given end state by finding suitable initial data that lead to it. Although we do not give a proof that one can "realize all end states" in solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2, we do point to some evidence in this direction by discussing some relevant results in the literature. As a simple example, we consider the following model equation in $1+1$ dimensions, obtained from the linearized scalar field equation (3.16) in the case the $\mathring{g} = g_{FLRW} = t^{2/3}\sum_{i=1}^{3}(dx^i)^2$ by dropping the linearized lapse terms and assuming dependence on only a single spatial variable:

$$-\partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi) + t^{1/3}\partial_x^2\varphi = 0. \tag{5.40}$$

In [12, 13], Beyer and LeFloch showed that given an asymptotic expansion for the end state of the form $\ln t\Psi_1(x) + \Psi_2(x)$, one can construct a solution φ to (5.40) existing on a slab of the form $(0, \delta] \times \mathbb{T}$ such that $\varphi = \ln t\Psi_1(x) + \Psi_2(x) + \mathcal{R}(t, x)$. Furthermore, their remainder term $\mathcal{R}(t, x)$ verifies $\mathcal{R}(t, x) = \mathcal{O}(t^{\alpha})$ for some constant $\alpha > 0$ and thus becomes negligible near $\{t = 0\}$. It would be interesting to know to what extent these results can be extended to apply to the full linearized system of Prop. 3.2; we do not pursue this issue here.

6. Comments on the nonlinear problem

We now provide some justification for why in the near-FLRW regime, our linear stability results are sufficiently strong to control the nonlinear terms and for why the nonlinear dynamics are not significantly distorted from the linear dynamics. The discussion here by no means constitutes a complete proof of the nonlinear stable singularity formation result proved in [42]. Rather, it is a foreshadowing of the role that the our linear stability statements play in the nonlinear problem. Our discussion here applies to solutions of the nonlinear equations of Prop. 3.1 that are near the FLRW solution $\mathbf{g}_{FLRW} = -dt^2 + g_{FLRW}$ (see (1.11)). In closing the nonlinear problem, we assume the small-data condition

$$\|g - g_{FLRW}\|_{L^2_{Frame}}(1) + \mathscr{H}_{(Frame);N}(1) \leq \epsilon, \tag{6.1}$$

where ϵ is a small positive parameter and N is a sufficiently large positive integer. In [42], we show that $N = 8$ is large enough to allow for closure of all nonlinear estimates at all orders.

Our aim here is sketch why versions of the linear energy inequalities (5.1) and (5.2) also hold for near-FLRW solutions to the nonlinear equations of Prop. 3.1; such a priori estimates constitute the main step in the proof of stable singularity formation in [42]. We begin by noting that the correct nonlinear analog of the linearized energy (4.5a) for the $\partial_{\vec{I}}$–differentiated metric variables is

$$\mathcal{E}^2_{(Metric);\vec{I}}(t) := \int_{\Sigma_t} \left\{ \left| t\partial_{\vec{I}}\hat{k} \right|^2_g + \frac{1}{4} \left| t\partial_{\vec{I}}\partial g \right|^2_g \right\} dx. \tag{6.2}$$

Similarly, the correct nonlinear analog of the total energy (4.5e) for the $\partial_{\vec{I}}$–differentiated variables is the quantity $\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta;\vec{I}}(t)$ defined by everywhere replacing the variables in (4.5e) with their $\partial_{\vec{I}}$–differentiated nonlinear versions and with the norms $|\cdot|_{\mathring{g}}$ replaced by $|\cdot|_g$.

To sketch the desired energy estimates, we will, for $|\vec{I}| \leq N$, compare the strength of the nonlinearities in the $\partial_{\vec{I}}$–commuted equations to the strength of $\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta;\vec{I}}(t)$. To keep the discussion short, we address only the nonlinear terms from the evolution equation (3.6b) for $k^i{}_j$ that are quadratic in the derivatives of g, that is, the quadratic terms coming from[20] the Ricci tensor of g. We will sketch a proof of the fact that these nonlinear terms lead to (for $\theta_* > 0$ well-chosen as before) an error integral of the form $C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1/3-c\kappa}\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*;\vec{I}}(s)\, ds$ to the linear energy inequality (5.1). That is, for $t \in (0, 1]$, we have

(6.3)

$$\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*;\vec{I}}(t) \leq \mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*;\vec{I}}(1) + \underbrace{C\epsilon \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1/3-c\kappa}\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*;\vec{I}}(s)\, ds}_{\text{error integral generated by the nonlinearities}} + \text{integrals as in (5.1)}$$

$$+ \text{additional nonlinear error integrals.}$$

[20] These terms generate cubic error integrals in the metric energy estimates that are similar to other error integrals that arise from integration by parts. For example, similar cubic error integrals arise from the nonlinear analog of (5.21).

Because the function $s^{-1/3-c\kappa}$ is integrable over the interval $s \in (0,1]$ for sufficiently small κ, the error integral $C\int_{s=t}^{1} s^{-1/3-c\kappa}\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*;\vec{I}}(s)\,ds$ poses no obstacle to deriving the desired priori energy estimate of the form

$$\mathcal{E}^2_{(Total);\theta_*;\vec{I}}(t) \leq C\epsilon^2 t^{-c\kappa}, \tag{6.4}$$

as in the linear estimate[21] (5.2).

We now explain the origin of the explicitly listed error integral in (6.3). For our purposes here, it is convenient to perform computations relative to the following frame[22] $\{e'_{(A)}\}_{A=1}^3$ and dual frame $\{\theta'^{(A)}\}_{A=1}^3$:

$$e'_{(A)} := t^{-1/3}\partial_A, \qquad \theta'^{(A)} := t^{1/3}dx^A. \tag{6.5}$$

The appeal of the frame $\{e'_{(A)}\}_{A=1}^3$ is that it is orthonormal as measured by the background metric g_{FLRW}, and, as we will explain, it is approximately orthonormal (in a weak sense) for the perturbed metric g. The perturbed metric and its inverse can be expanded as

$$g = g_{AB}\theta'^{(A)} \otimes \theta'^{(B)}, \qquad g^{-1} = (g^{-1})^{AB} e'_{(A)} \otimes e'_{(B)}. \tag{6.6}$$

The estimates (5.4c) and (5.4d) and Sobolev embedding suggest that in the nonlinear problem, we can prove the following coordinate component estimates for $|\vec{I}| \leq N-3$:

$$|\partial_{\vec{I}}\{g_{ij} - (g_{FLRW})_{ij}\}| \lesssim t^{2/3-c\kappa}, \qquad \left|\partial_{\vec{I}}\left\{g^{ij} - (g^{-1}_{FLRW})^{ij}\right\}\right| \lesssim t^{-2/3-c\kappa}. \tag{6.7}$$

Indeed, as part of the bootstrap argument in [42], we show that the estimates (6.7) hold, and we shall take them for granted here. Contracting inequalities (6.7) against the frame/dual frame, we find that they are approximately orthonormal for the metric g in the following weak sense (for $|\vec{I}| \leq N-3$):

$$|\partial_{\vec{I}}\{g_{AB} - \delta_{AB}\}| \lesssim t^{-c\kappa}, \qquad \left|\partial_{\vec{I}}\left\{g^{AB} - \delta^{AB}\right\}\right| \lesssim t^{-c\kappa}, \tag{6.8}$$

where δ_{AB} and δ^{AB} are standard Kronecker deltas.

The connection coefficients of the frame relative to g are given by[23]

$$\nabla_{e'_{(A)}} e'_{(B)} = (g^{-1})^{CD}\gamma_{ADB}e'_{(C)}, \tag{6.9}$$

where since the vectorfield commutators $[e'_{(A)}, e'_{(B)}]$ vanish, we have[24]

$$\gamma_{ACB} = \frac{1}{2}\left\{e'_{(A)}(g_{CB}) + e'_{(B)}(g_{AC}) - e'_{(C)}(g_{AB})\right\}. \tag{6.10}$$

Next, we note the following standard expression for the Ricci curvature of g : $Ric = Ric^A{}_B e'_{(A)} \otimes \theta'^{(B)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Ric^A{}_B = {} & (g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}e'_{(C)}(\gamma_{EFB}) - (g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}e'_{(E)}(\gamma_{BCF}) \\ & + (g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}(g^{-1})^{DH}\gamma_{CFD}\gamma_{EHB} - (g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}(g^{-1})^{DH}\gamma_{EFD}\gamma_{CHB}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

[21] In the nonlinear problem, κ cannot be defined in terms of tk_{FLRW}, whose trace-free part vanishes. Instead, it should be viewed as a small constant representing the maximum size of the trace-free part of tk, whose size will be controlled by a bootstrap argument. Justification for this approach is provided by inequality (5.4b).

[22] Below, $\partial_A := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^A}$, with $\{x^A\}_{A=1,2,3}$ denoting the transported spatial coordinates.

[23] Recall that ∇ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of g.

[24] We are using here the standard notation $X(f) := X^a\partial_a f$, where X is a vectorfield and f is a function.

We now examine the evolution equation (3.6b). In view of (6.11), we see that relative to the frame/dual frame (6.5), the $\partial_{\bar{I}}-$commuted evolution equation (3.6b) reads

$$\partial_t(t\partial_{\bar{I}}k^A_{\ B}) = (g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}e'_{(C)}(\partial_{\bar{I}}\gamma_{EFB}) - (g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}e'_{(E)}(\partial_{\bar{I}}\gamma_{BCF}) + \underbrace{(g^{-1})^{AE}(g^{-1})^{CF}(g^{-1})^{DH}\gamma_{CFD}\partial_{\bar{I}}\gamma_{EHB}}_{\text{top-order term}} + \cdots, \tag{6.12}$$

where, for the purposes of illustration, we have kept only the linear Ricci terms and a single quadratic term involving a top-order factor. Revisiting the proof of Prop. 5.2, we find that the quadratic term contributes the following "new" cubic integral to the right-hand side of the energy inequality (6.3):

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s}(g^{-1})^{AB}(g^{-1})^{CF}(g^{-1})^{DH}\gamma_{CFD}(s\partial_{\bar{I}}\gamma_{EHB})(s\partial_{\bar{I}}\hat{k}^E_{\ A})\,dx\,ds\right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s}|\gamma|_g\,|s\partial_{\bar{I}}\gamma|_g\,\left|s\partial_{\bar{I}}\hat{k}\right|_g\,dx\,ds \\ &\lesssim \int_{s=t}^1 \||\gamma|_g\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_s)}\,\mathcal{E}^2_{\bar{I}}(s)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

Hence, to understand the origin of the error integral in (6.3), it remains only for us to show that

$$\||\gamma|_g\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_t)} \lesssim t^{-1/3-c\kappa}. \tag{6.14}$$

To this end, we first note that (6.7) implies that

$$|\gamma_{ACE}| \lesssim \epsilon t^{-1/3-c\kappa}, \tag{6.15}$$

where in deriving (6.15), we have incurred three factors of $t^{-1/3}$ relative to the estimate (6.7), one for each contraction against a frame vector belonging to $\{e'_{(A)}\}_{A=1}^3$. We therefore deduce from (6.8) and (6.15) that

$$|\gamma|^2_g = (g^{-1})^{AB}(g^{-1})^{CD}(g^{-1})^{EF}\gamma_{ACE}\gamma_{BDF} \lesssim t^{-2/3-c\kappa}, \tag{6.16}$$

as desired.

7. A Second Proof of Linearized Stability via Parabolic Lapse Gauges

In this section, we introduce a new family of gauges for the Einstein-scalar field system and show that a version of the approximate L^2 monotonicity inequality (5.1) can also be derived in solutions to linearized (around the Kasner backgrounds) versions of the equations in these gauges. The gauges involve a parabolic equation for the lapse variable n that depends on a real number λ. The approximate monotonicity is present for near-FLRW Kasner backgrounds in the parameter range $3 \le \lambda < \infty$. As we will see, in this parameter range, *the parabolic lapse PDEs are locally well-posed only in the past direction*. Formally, $\lambda = \infty$ corresponds to the CMC lapse equation. However, our proof of approximate monotonicity in the parabolic gauges is somewhat different than in the CMC case and does not allow us to directly recover the results of Sect. 5 by taking a limit $\lambda \to \infty$.

7.1. **Choice of a gauge and the corresponding formulation of the Einstein-scalar field equations.**

In formulating the nonlinear Einstein-scalar field equations in the new gauges, we continue to use transported spatial coordinates and to decompose $\mathbf{g} = -n^2dt^2 + g_{ab}dx^adx^b$ as in (1.7). We now fix the lapse gauge.

Definition 7.1 (**Choice of a parabolic lapse gauge**)**.** Let $\lambda \neq 0$ be a real number. We now impose the following relation, which fixes the lapse gauge:

$$\lambda^{-1}(n-1) = tk^a{}_a + 1. \tag{7.1}$$

Remark 7.1. Note that the CMC-transported spatial coordinates gauge of Sect. 3 corresponds to $\lambda = \infty$.

We now provide the (nonlinear) Einstein-scalar field equations relative to the gauge (7.1) with transported spatial coordinates.

Proposition 7.1 (**The Einstein-scalar field equations in the gauge** (7.1) **with transported spatial coordinates**)**.** *Under the gauge condition* (7.1) *and with transported spatial coordinates, the Einstein-scalar field system consists of the following equations.*

The ***Hamiltonian and momentum constraint equations*** *verified by $g_{ij}, k^i{}_j$, and ϕ are respectively:*

$$R - k^a{}_b k^b{}_a + \underbrace{(k^a{}_a)^2}_{t^{-2}\{\lambda^{-1}(n-1)-1\}^2} = \overbrace{(n^{-1}\partial_t\phi)^2 + g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi}^{2\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}},\hat{\mathbf{N}})}, \tag{7.2a}$$

$$\nabla_a k^a_i - \underbrace{\nabla_i k^a{}_a}_{\lambda^{-1}t^{-1}\nabla_i n} = \underbrace{-n^{-1}\partial_t\phi\nabla_i\phi}_{-\mathbf{T}(\hat{\mathbf{N}},\partial_i)}. \tag{7.2b}$$

The ***evolution equations*** *verified by g_{ij} and $k^i{}_j$ are:*

$$\partial_t g_{ij} = -2n g_{ia} k^a{}_j, \tag{7.3a}$$

$$\partial_t k^i{}_j = -g^{ia}\nabla_a\nabla_j n + n\Big\{Ric^i{}_j + \underbrace{k^a{}_a k^i{}_j}_{t^{-1}\{\lambda^{-1}(n-1)-1\}k^i{}_j} \underbrace{-g^{ia}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_j\phi}_{-T^i{}_j+(1/2)I^i{}_j\mathbf{T}}\Big\}, \tag{7.3b}$$

where R denotes the scalar curvature of g_{ij}, $Ric^i{}_j$ denotes the Ricci curvature of g_{ij}, $I^i{}_j = diag(1,1,1)$ denotes the identity transformation, and $\mathbf{T} := (\mathbf{g}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{T}_{\alpha\beta}$ denotes the trace of the energy-momentum tensor (1.2)*.*

The ***volume form factor*** *$\sqrt{\det g}$ verifies the auxiliary equation*[25]

$$\partial_t \ln\left(t^{-1}\sqrt{\det g}\right) = (1-\lambda^{-1})\frac{n-1}{t}. \tag{7.4}$$

The ***scalar field wave equation*** *is:*

$$\overbrace{-n^{-1}\partial_t(n^{-1}\partial_t\phi)}^{-\mathbf{D}_{\hat{\mathbf{N}}}\mathbf{D}_{\hat{\mathbf{N}}}\phi} + g^{ab}\nabla_a\nabla_b\phi = \overbrace{\frac{1}{t}n^{-1}\left\{1-\lambda^{-1}(n-1)\right\}\partial_t\phi}^{-tr k\mathbf{D}_{\hat{\mathbf{N}}}\phi} - n^{-1}g^{ab}\nabla_a n\nabla_b\phi. \tag{7.5}$$

The ***parabolic lapse equation*** *is:*

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{-1}\frac{1}{t}\partial_t(n-1) + g^{ab}\nabla_a\nabla_b(n-1) &= (n-1)\Big\{\frac{1}{t^2}(1-\lambda^{-1}) + R - g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi\Big\} \\ &\quad + \lambda^{-1}(\lambda^{-1}-2)\frac{1}{t^2}(n-1)^2 + \lambda^{-2}\frac{1}{t^2}(n-1)^3 + R - g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi.\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

When $\lambda > 0$, the gauge condition (7.1) *and the constraints* (7.2a)-(7.2b) *are preserved by the* ***past*** *flow of the remaining equations if they are verified by the data.*

[25] This equation, which we do not use in the present article, is implied by (3.6a) and the gauge condition (7.1).

Remark 7.2. We are primarily interested in the gauge (7.1) when $\lambda \geq 3$. Note that when $\lambda > 0$, the parabolic equation (7.4) is locally well posed only in the *past* direction.

Proof of Prop. 7.1. The proposition can be proved by making simple modifications to the standard arguments that yield Prop. 3.1. □

7.2. **Linearizing around Kasner.** In the next proposition, we linearize the equations of Prop. 7.1 around the Kasner solution (1.8). As in Prop. 3.2, the linearized equations can be derived from straightforward algebraic calculations and hence we do not provide a detailed derivation.

Proposition 7.2 (**The linearized Einstein-scalar field equations in the gauge** (7.1) **with transported spatial coordinates**). *Consider the equations of Prop. 7.1 linearized around the Kasner solution* (1.8). *The linearized equations in the unknowns* (h, K, φ, ν) *take the following form (see Def. 3.1 for the definitions of some of the quantities).*

The ***linearized parabolic gauge condition*** (7.1) *is:*

$$K^a_{\ a} = \lambda^{-1}\nu. \tag{7.7}$$

The ***linearized versions of the Hamiltonian and momentum constraint equations*** (7.2a)-(7.2b) *are:*

$$t^{2(h)}R - 2\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a_{\ b}K^b_{\ a} - 2At\partial_t\varphi + 2(A^2 - \lambda^{-1})\nu = 0, \tag{7.8a}$$

$$\partial_a K^a_{\ i} = \lambda^{-1}\partial_i\nu - A\partial_i\varphi - {}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\ b}^{\ a}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^b_{\ i} + {}^{(h)}\Gamma_{a\ i}^{\ b}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a_{\ b}, \tag{7.8b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a K^i_{\ b} = {}& \lambda^{-1}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_a\nu - A(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_a\varphi \\ & - (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab(h)}\Gamma_{a\ c}^{\ i}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^c_{\ b} + (\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab(h)}\Gamma_{a\ b}^{\ c}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^i_{\ c}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.8c}$$

The ***linearized version of the lapse equation*** (7.6) *can be expressed in either of the following two forms:*

$$2At\partial_t\varphi + 2\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a_{\ b}K^b_{\ a} = \lambda^{-1}t\partial_t\nu + t^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\nu + (2A^2 - 1 - \lambda^{-1})\nu, \tag{7.9a}$$

$$\lambda^{-1}t\partial_t\nu + t^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\nu - (1 - \lambda^{-1})\nu = t^{2(h)}R. \tag{7.9b}$$

Equation (7.8a) *can be used to show that* (7.9a) *is equivalent to* (7.9b).

The ***linearized versions of the metric evolution equations*** (7.3a)-(7.3b) *are:*

$$\partial_t h_{ij} = -2t^{-1}\mathring{K}^a_{\ j}h_{ia} - 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ia}K^a_{\ j} - 2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ia}\mathring{K}^a_{\ j}\nu, \tag{7.10a}$$

$$\partial_t K^i_{\ j} = -t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_a\partial_j\nu - (1 - \lambda^{-1})t^{-1}\mathring{K}^i_{\ j}\nu + t^{(h)}Ric^i_{\ j}. \tag{7.10b}$$

The ***linearized version of the scalar field wave equation*** (7.5) *is:*

$$-\partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi) + t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\varphi = -A\partial_t\nu + A(1 - \lambda^{-1})t^{-1}\nu. \tag{7.11}$$

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that of Prop. 3.2. In the gauge (7.1) and thus in Prop. 7.2, the linearly small quantities are the same as the ones from Def. 3.1 except that $K^a_{\ a} := tk^a_{\ a} - t\mathring{k}^a_{\ a} = \lambda^{-1}(n-1) = \lambda^{-1}\nu$ is now linearly small rather than completely vanishing as it did in Prop. 3.2. □

7.3. **Statement of the main monotonicity theorem.** We now state our main monotonicity theorem for solutions to the linear equations of Prop. 7.2. It is a direct analog of Theorem 5.1. The theorem involves the following energies and norms, which provide slightly different estimates for the lapse compared to the CMC gauge. The main point is that we are no longer able to obtain control over the highest-order analog of $\|\partial^2\nu\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}}$ because of the nature of parabolic energy estimates. We are, however, able to control

a spacetime integral of the highest-order analog of $\partial^2\nu$, which is provided by the highest-order analog of the first term on the second line of the right-hand side of (7.20).

Definition 7.2 (Energies). In terms of the quantities defined in Def. 4.4, we define the following energy for $t \in (0,1]$:

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\nu](t) := \theta\mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](t) + \mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](t) + \mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\nu](t). \tag{7.12}$$

As in Sect. 5, θ is a small positive constant that we will choose below in order to exhibit the monotonicity.

We will also use the following up-to-order M energy:

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta;M}(t) := \sum_{|\vec{I}|\leq M} \mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta}[\partial_{\vec{I}}K,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}h,\partial_t\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\varphi,\partial_{\vec{I}}\nu](t). \tag{7.13}$$

Definition 7.3 (Solution norms). In terms of the Sobolev norms of Def. 4.2, we define the solution norms

(7.14)

$$\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);M}(t) := \|K\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + \|\partial h\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + \|t\partial_t\varphi\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + t^{2/3}\|\partial\varphi\|_{H^M_{Frame}} + \sum_{p=0}^{1} t^{(2/3)p}\|\nu\|_{H^{M+p}}\,.$$

Remark 7.3. Note that $\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);0}$ controls one derivative of ν while $\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\nu]$ does not.

Theorem 7.1 (Approximate L^2 monotonicity for solutions to the linearized equations corresponding to the parabolic lapse gauge). *There exist a small constant $\theta_* > 0$ and constants $C, c > 0$ such that if the parabolic gauge parameter verifies $\lambda \geq 3$, if $\kappa \geq 0$ is sufficiently small (see definition 1.12b), and if $\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);0}(1) < \infty$ (see definition* (7.14)*), then solutions to the linearized equations of Prop. 7.2 verify the following inequality for $t \in (0,1]$, where $\mathscr{E}_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*}$ is defined by* (7.12)*:*

(7.15)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\nu](t) \leq\ & C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\partial\nu,\nu](1)\\ & \underbrace{-\frac{1}{6}\theta_*\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign}} \underbrace{-\frac{1}{12}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign}}\\ & \underbrace{-\frac{1}{21}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign}} \underbrace{-\frac{2}{9}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign}}\\ & \underbrace{+c\kappa\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\partial\nu,\nu](s)\,ds}_{\textit{error integral that can create energy growth}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the following inequality holds for $t \in (0,1]$:

$$\mathscr{E}_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\nu](t) \leq C\mathscr{E}_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*}[K,\partial h,\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi,\nu](1)t^{-c\kappa}. \tag{7.16}$$

In addition, if $N \geq 0$ is an integer and $\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1) < \infty$ (see definition (7.14)*), then the total energy* (4.6) *verifies the following inequality for $t \in (0,1]$:*

$$\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta_*;N}(t) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1)t^{-c\kappa} & \text{if } \kappa \neq 0, \\ C\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1)(1+|\ln t|) & \text{if } \kappa = 0. \end{cases} \tag{7.17}$$

In addition, if $N \geq 0$ is an integer and $\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1) < \infty$, then the total solution norm (7.14) *verifies the following inequality for $t \in (0,1]$:*

$$\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(t) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1)t^{-c\kappa} & \text{if } \kappa \neq 0, \\ C\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1)(1+|\ln t|) & \text{if } \kappa = 0. \end{cases} \tag{7.18}$$

Remark 7.4. The assumption $\lambda \geq 3$ can be improved to $\lambda > 2$. We avoid providing the messy algebraic details of the improvement because the constants C and c as well as the allowable smallness of κ depend on λ in the full range $\lambda > 2$.

Remark 7.5. Based on the estimates of Theorem 7.1, we could also prove an analog of Theorem 5.2 in the parabolic lapse gauges for $\lambda \geq 3$. Since the results and proof of the theorem would closely resemble those of Theorem 5.2, we do not provide the details.

7.4. **Preliminary estimates and identities towards the proof of Theorem 7.1.** In our proof of Theorem 7.1, we use the following comparison lemma, which can be proved by using arguments similar to the ones we used to prove Lemma 4.3 (except that clearly we no do not use the elliptic estimate provided by Lemma 4.2); we omit the simple proof.

Lemma 7.3 (Parabolic energy-norm comparison lemma). *Let $N \geq 0$ be an integer and let $\kappa \geq 0$ be as defined in* (1.12b)*. There exist constants $C, c > 0$ depending on θ such that the following comparison estimates hold for the norm* (7.14) *and the total energy* (4.6) *on the interval $t \in (0,1]$:*

$$\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta;N}(t) \leq Ct^{-c\kappa}\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(t), \tag{7.19a}$$

$$\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(t) \leq Ct^{-c\kappa}\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta;N}(t). \tag{7.19b}$$

□

We will also use the following simple parabolic energy estimate, which can be used to derive top-order L^2 estimates for the linearized lapse variable.

Lemma 7.4 (Parabolic energy estimate for ν). *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that if the parabolic gauge parameter* (7.1) *verifies $\lambda \geq 3$ and $\kappa \geq 0$ (see definition 1.12b), then solutions ν to the linear parabolic equation* (7.9a) *verify the following inequality for $t \in (0,1]$:*

(7.20)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_t} |t\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx \leq{}& \lambda^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_1} |\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx \\ &- \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s^2\partial^2\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx\,ds - \lambda^{-1}\left(\frac{4}{3}-2\kappa\right)\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|_{\mathring{g}}^2\,dx\,ds \\ &+ C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a)^2\,dx\,ds + C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}(s\partial_t\varphi)^2\,dx\,ds + C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Integrating by parts over $[t,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$ (we stress that $t\leq 1$) we deduce (without using any equation)

$$\lambda^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_t}|t\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx=\lambda^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_1}|\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx-2\lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}+s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_b\partial_a\nu\partial_c\nu\,dx\,ds \\ +2\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s}s(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu(\lambda^{-1}s\partial_t\nu)\,dx\,ds. \tag{7.21}$$

Using equation (7.9a) to substitute for $\lambda^{-1}s\partial_t\nu$ in (7.21) and integrating by parts over Σ_s on the term $\{(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu\}^2$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_t}|t\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx=\lambda^{-1}&\int_{\Sigma_1}|\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\\ &-2\lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}+s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_b\partial_a\nu\partial_c\nu\,dx\,ds\\ &-2\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s^2\partial^2\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds\\ &-(2A^2-1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s}s\nu(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu\,dx\,ds\\ &+4A\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s}s^2\partial_t\varphi(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu\,dx\,ds+4\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s}s\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_bK^b{}_a(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu\,dx\,ds.\end{aligned} \tag{7.22}$$

Using inequality (5.30), we estimate the second integral on the right-hand side of (7.22) as follows:

$$-2\lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}+s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_b\partial_a\nu\partial_c\nu\,dx\,ds\leq-\lambda^{-1}\left(\frac{4}{3}-2\kappa\right)\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds. \tag{7.23}$$

Using the simple estimate $A\leq\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$, the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, and the simple estimate $\|(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef}\partial_e\partial_f\nu\|_{L^2}\lesssim\|\partial^2\nu\|_{L^2_{\mathring{g}}}$, we deduce that the four integrals on the third through fifth lines of the right-hand side of (7.22) are collectively bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq-\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s^2\partial^2\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds\\ &+C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds+C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}(s\partial_t\varphi)^2\,dx\,ds+C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_bK^b{}_a)^2\,dx\,ds.\end{aligned} \tag{7.24}$$

The desired inequality (7.20) now follows easily from the identities (1.12b) and (7.22) and the inequalities (7.23) and (7.24).

□

As in the proof of Theorem 5.1, the most important step in the proof of Theorem 7.1 is provided by an energy identity for the linearized scalar field and lapse that simultaneously yields favorably signed (to the past) integrals for both variables. We provide this identity in the next proposition.

Proposition 7.5 (Combined energy identity for the linearized scalar field and and linearized lapse in the parabolic lapse gauge). *Assume that the parabolic gauge parameter verifies* $\lambda\neq 0$. *Then solutions to*

the linearized equations of Prop. 7.2 verify the following identity for $t \in (0,1]$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(7.25)\qquad & \int_{\Sigma_t} (t\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |t\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx + \Big\{A^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda^{-1})\Big\}\int_{\Sigma_t}\nu^2\,dx - A\int_{\Sigma_t}\mathcal{Q}_4(t\partial_t\varphi,\nu)\,dx \\
&= \int_{\Sigma_1} (\partial_t\varphi)^2 + t^2|\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx + \Big\{A^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda^{-1})\Big\}\int_{\Sigma_1}\nu^2\,dx - A\int_{\Sigma_1}\mathcal{Q}_4(\partial_t\varphi,\nu)\,dx \\
&\underbrace{-2\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \mathcal{C}_2(\mathring{K}, s\partial\varphi, s\partial\varphi)\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign}} \\
&\underbrace{-(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign for } \lambda > 1} \\
&\underbrace{-(1-\lambda^{-2})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign for } \lambda > 1} \\
&- A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}_1(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds \\
&- (1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}_1(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, \nu)\,dx\,ds,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the constant $0 \le A \le \sqrt{2/3}$ *is defined in* (1.9b)*, the cubic forms* $\mathcal{C}_i(\cdots)$ *and the quadratic form* $\mathcal{Q}_1(\cdots)$ *are defined in* (5.8a)-(5.8c)*, and*

$$
(7.26)\qquad \mathcal{Q}_4(t\partial_t\varphi,\nu) := 2t\partial_t\varphi\nu.
$$

Proof. The proof has some features in common with our proof of Prop. 7.5, but other aspects of it are different. Again, the main idea is to combine three integration by parts identities in suitable proportions. To obtain the first identity, we divide equation (7.9a) by t and then replace t with the integration variable s, multiply by $(1-\lambda^{-1})\nu$, and integrate by parts over $(s,x) \in [t,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$ (we stress that $t \le 1$) to deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(7.27)\qquad \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{\Sigma_t}\nu^2\,dx &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{\Sigma_1}\nu^2\,dx \\
&\quad - (1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s^2\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds \\
&\quad + (2A^2 - 1 - \lambda^{-1})(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds \\
&\quad - 2A(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx\,ds \\
&\quad - 2(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a\nu\,dx\,ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

To obtain the second identity, we replace t with the integration variable s in equation (7.11), multiply by $-s\partial_t\varphi$, and integrate by parts over $(s,x) \in [t,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$ (we stress that $t \le 1$) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}(7.28)\qquad \int_{\Sigma_t} (t\partial_t\varphi)^2 + t^2|\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx = \int_{\Sigma_1} (\partial_t\varphi)^2 + |\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx \\ - 2\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}} + s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\mathring{K}^c{}_b\partial_a\varphi\partial_c\varphi\,dx\,ds \\ - 2A\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu\,dx\,ds + 2A(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that equation (7.11) implies

$$(7.29)\qquad t\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu = \partial_t(t\partial_t\varphi\nu) - \frac{1}{2}A\partial_t(\nu^2) - t\nu(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b\varphi + A(1-\lambda^{-1})t^{-1}\nu^2.$$

To obtain the third identity, we replace t with the integration variable s in equation (7.29), multiply by $2A$, and integrate by parts over $(s,x) \in [t,1]\times\mathbb{T}^3$ to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}(7.30)\qquad &- 2A\int_{\Sigma_t} t\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx + A^2\int_{\Sigma_t}\nu^2\,dx \\ &= -2A\int_{\Sigma_1}\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx + A^2\int_{\Sigma_1}\nu^2\,dx \\ &\quad + 2A\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu\,dx\,ds \\ &\quad - 2A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} s^2(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ab}\partial_a\varphi\partial_b\nu\,dx\,ds - 2A^2(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

Adding (7.27), (7.28), and (7.30), and noting the cancellation of the integrals $\pm 2A\int_{s=t}^1\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\partial_t\nu\,dx\,ds$ and $\pm 2A(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} s\partial_t\varphi\nu\,dx\,ds$, we arrive at the desired identity (7.25). □

In the next proposition, we derive an energy identity for the linearized metric solution variables. It is an analog of Prop. 5.2.

Proposition 7.6 (**Energy identity for the linearized metric variables in the parabolic lapse gauge**). *Assume that the parabolic gauge parameter verifies* $\lambda \neq 0$. *Then solutions to the linearized equations of*

Prop. 7.2 verify the following identity for $t \in (0,1]$:

(7.31)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Sigma_t} |K|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{1}{4}|t\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\, dx = {} & \int_{\Sigma_1} |K|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{1}{4}|\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\, dx \\ & \underbrace{-\frac{1}{2}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \mathcal{C}_3(\mathring{K}, s\partial h, s\partial h)\, dx\, ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign}} \\ & \underbrace{-2\lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} |s\partial \nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\, dx\, ds}_{\textit{past-favorable sign for } \lambda > 0} \\ & + \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_4(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, K)\, dx\, ds + \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_5(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial h)\, dx\, ds \\ & + \int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_6(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, s\partial h, s\partial \nu)\, dx\, ds + (1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{C}_7(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, \nu)\, dx\, ds \\ & + A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{Q}_2(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\nu)\, dx\, ds - A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{Q}_3(s\partial h, s\partial\varphi)\, dx\, ds, \\ & + \lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s} \mathcal{Q}_3(s\partial h, s\partial\nu)\, dx\, ds,\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $0 \le A \le \sqrt{2/3}$ *is defined in* (1.9b) *and the cubic forms* $\mathcal{C}_i(\cdots)$ *and the quadratic forms* $\mathcal{Q}_i(\cdots)$ *are defined in* (5.14a)-(5.14g).

Proof of Prop. 7.6. We repeat the proof of Prop. 5.2 and take into account the few differences between the linearized equations of Prop. 3.2 and the linearized equations of Prop. 7.2. In particular, the identity (5.24) holds in the present context, but with the next-to-last term $-2t^{-1}\mathring{g}_{ab}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ij}\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a_{\ i}K^b_{\ j}\nu$ multiplied by the factor $1 - \lambda^{-1}$ (coming from the second term on the right-hand side of (7.10b)) and two additional terms: **i)** the term $2\lambda^{-1}t|\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}$ coming from the analog of the step (5.19) and the presence of the term $\lambda^{-1}\partial_i\nu$ on the right-hand side of equation (7.8b) and **ii)** the cross term $-2\lambda^{-1}t(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ef(h)}\Gamma^{\ a}_{e\ f}\partial_a\nu$ coming from the analog of steps (5.22) and (5.23) and the presence of the term $\lambda^{-1}\partial_i\nu$ on the right-hand side of equation (7.8b) and the term $\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{g}^{-1})^{ia}\partial_a\nu$ on the right-hand side of (7.8c). □

7.5. **Proof of Theorem 7.1.** We now prove Theorem 7.1. Below we will prove that the following two inequalities hold for $t \in (0,1]$:

(7.32)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](t)+\mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\nu](t)\\
&\leq C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Scalar)}[\partial_t\varphi,\partial\varphi](1)+C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Lapse)}[\nu](1)\\
&\quad\underbrace{-\left(\frac{1}{6}-2\kappa\right)\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign for sufficiently small }\kappa}\\
&\underbrace{-\frac{2}{21}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\underbrace{-\frac{4}{9}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\\
&+C\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}^2(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K)\,dx\,ds,
\end{aligned}$$

(7.33)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](t)\leq\mathscr{E}^2_{(Metric)}[K,\partial h](1)\\
&\quad\underbrace{-\frac{1}{3}(1-C\kappa)\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial h|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign for small }\kappa}\\
&\underbrace{-2\lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds}_{\text{past-favorable sign}}\\
&+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}(s\partial h,s\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds\\
&+A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}(s\partial h,s\partial\varphi)\,dx\,ds+A\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}(s\partial\varphi,s\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds\\
&+\lambda^{-1}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{Q}(s\partial h,s\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds\\
&+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},s\partial h,s\partial h)\,dx\,ds+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},s\partial h,s\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds\\
&+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,K)\,dx\,ds+(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},K,\nu)\,dx\,ds\\
&+\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathring{K}},\partial h,\partial\nu)\,dx\,ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}(X,Y)$ denotes a non-negative quadratic term that can be pointwise bounded by $\mathcal{Q}(X,Y)\lesssim|X|_{\mathring{g}}|Y|_{\mathring{g}}$, and $\mathcal{C}(X,Y,Z)$ denotes a non-negative cubic term that can be pointwise bounded by $\mathcal{C}(X,Y,Z)\lesssim|X|_{\mathring{g}}|Y|_{\mathring{g}}|Z|_{\mathring{g}}$.

The proofs of (7.15) and (7.16) then follow from (7.32)-(7.33) as straightforward adaptations of the proofs of (5.1) and (5.2). Furthermore, if $\mathscr{H}_{(Parabolic\ Frame);N}(1)<\infty$, then by commuting the equations

of Prop. 7.2 with $\partial_{\vec{I}}$ for $|\vec{I}| \leq N$ and arguing as in the proof of (7.16), we deduce that (see definition (7.13))

$$\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*;N}(t) \leq C\mathscr{E}^2_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*;N}(1)t^{-c\kappa}. \tag{7.34}$$

Inequality (7.17) will then follow from (7.34) and Lemma 7.3 at $t = 1$ after we estimate the top-order terms in $\mathscr{E}_{(Total);\theta_*;N}$ that are not present in $\mathscr{E}_{(Almost\ Total);\theta_*;N}$, namely, $\mathscr{E}^2_{(\partial Lapse)}[\partial\partial_{\vec{I}}\nu](t)$ (see definition 4.5c) when $|\vec{I}| = N$. To this end, we consider the $\partial_{\vec{I}}-$commuted version of inequality (7.20) in which all linearized solution variables are replaced with their $\partial_{\vec{I}}-$commuted counterparts. Inserting the estimates implied by (7.34) into the last three integrals on the right-hand side of the $\partial_{\vec{I}}-$commuted version of (7.20), carrying out straightforward computations, and using Lemma 7.3 at $t = 1$, we conclude the desired estimate (7.17).

Inequality (7.18) then follows from inequality (7.17) and Lemma 7.3.

It remains for us to prove (7.32) and (7.33). Inequality (7.32) follows from the identity (7.25) and a few simple applications of Cauchy-Schwarz, which we now describe. First, the left-hand side of (7.25) is positive definite in $\int_{\Sigma_t}(t\partial_t\varphi)^2\,dx$, $\int_{\Sigma_t} t^2|\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx$, and $\int_{\Sigma_t}\nu^2\,dx$, as can easily be seen from the simple pointwise estimate

$$|A\mathcal{Q}_4(\partial_t\varphi,\nu)| \leq \frac{A^2}{A^2+\frac{1}{4}\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda^{-1})}(t\partial_t\varphi)^2 + \left\{A^2+\frac{1}{4}\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda^{-1})\right\}\nu^2. \tag{7.35}$$

Next, we note that since $\lambda \geq 3$, the three spacetime integrals on the right-hand side of (7.25) with integrands

$$-2\left\{|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \mathcal{C}_2(\mathring{K}, s\partial\varphi, s\partial\varphi)\right\}, \tag{7.36}$$

$$-(1-\lambda^{-1})|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}, \tag{7.37}$$

$$-A\mathcal{Q}_1(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\nu) \tag{7.38}$$

are collectively bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq -\left\{\frac{4}{3}-2\kappa-\frac{7}{6}\right\}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds - \left(1-\frac{6}{7}\right)(1-\lambda^{-1})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds \\
&\leq -\left\{\frac{1}{6}-2\kappa\right\}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds - \frac{2}{21}\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\,dx\,ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.39}$$

an estimate that follows from the pointwise estimate (5.30) and the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
A\,|\mathcal{Q}_1(s\partial\varphi, s\partial\nu)| \leq A\left\{|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}} + |s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}\right\} &\leq \frac{7}{6}\times\frac{A^2}{1-\lambda^{-1}}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{6}{7}(1-\lambda^{-1})|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}} \\
&\leq \frac{7}{6}|s\partial\varphi|^2_{\mathring{g}} + \frac{6}{7}(1-\lambda^{-1})|s\partial\nu|^2_{\mathring{g}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.40}$$

In the last step of (7.40), we have used the simple inequality $A^2 \leq \frac{2}{3}$. To control the last integral on the right-hand side of (7.25), we bound its integrand via the simple estimate

$$(1-\lambda^{-1})s^{-1}\left|\mathcal{C}_1(\widehat{\mathring{K}}, K, \nu)\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}(1-\lambda^{-2})s^{-1}\nu^2 + 2\frac{1-\lambda^{-1}}{1+\lambda^{-1}}s^{-1}(\widehat{\mathring{K}}^a{}_b K^b{}_a)^2, \tag{7.41}$$

which allows us to soak the portion $\frac{1}{2}(1-\lambda^{-2})s^{-1}\nu^2$ into the spacetime integral $-(1-\lambda^{-2})\int_{s=t}^1 s^{-1}\int_{\Sigma_s}\nu^2\,dx\,ds$ on the right-hand side of (7.25). In total, these estimates yield (7.32).

Inequality (7.33) can be derived from the identity (7.31) by a straightforward modification of the argument we used to prove (5.26). □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Mihalis Dafermos for offering enlightening comments on an earlier version of this work. IR gratefully acknowledges support from NSF grant # DMS-1001500. JS gratefully acknowledges support from NSF grant # DMS-1162211 and from a Solomon Buchsbaum grant administered by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

REFERENCES

[1] Lars Andersson and Vincent Moncrief, *Elliptic-hyperbolic systems and the Einstein equations*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **4** (2003), no. 1, 1–34. MR1967177 (2004c:58060)

[2] ———, *Future complete vacuum spacetimes*, The Einstein equations and the large scale behavior of gravitational fields, 2004, pp. 299–330. MR2098919 (2006c:83004)

[3] ———, *Einstein spaces as attractors for the Einstein flow*, J. Differential Geom. **89** (2011), no. 1, 1–47. MR2863911

[4] Lars Andersson, Vincent Moncrief, and Anthony J. Tromba, *On the global evolution problem in* $2 + 1$ *gravity*, J. Geom. Phys. **23** (1997), no. 3-4, 191–205. MR1484587 (98m:83006)

[5] Lars Andersson and Alan D. Rendall, *Quiescent cosmological singularities*, Comm. Math. Phys. **218** (2001), no. 3, 479–511. MR1828850 (2002h:83072)

[6] K. Anguige and K. Paul Tod, *Isotropic cosmological singularities. I. Polytropic perfect fluid spacetimes*, Ann. Physics **276** (1999), no. 2, 257–293. MR1710663 (2001a:83009a)

[7] Keith Anguige, *A class of plane symmetric perfect-fluid cosmologies with a Kasner-like singularity*, Classical Quantum Gravity **17** (2000), no. 10, 2117–2128. MR1766545 (2001g:83032)

[8] Jayashree Balakrishna, Gregory Daues, Edward Seidel, Wai-Mo Suen, Malcolm Tobias, and Edward Wang, *Coordinate conditions in three-dimensional numerical relativity*, Classical Quantum Gravity **13** (1996), no. 12, L135–L142. MR1425525 (97g:83005)

[9] John D. Barrow, *Quiescent cosmology*, Nature **272** (1978), 211–215.

[10] Robert Bartnik, *The mass of an asymptotically flat manifold*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), no. 5, 661–693. MR849427 (88b:58144)

[11] V. A. Belinskiĭ and I. M. Khalatnikov, *Effect of scalar and vector fields on the nature of the cosmological singularity*, Ž. Èksper. Teoret. Fiz. **63** (1972), 1121–1134. MR0363384 (50 #15822)

[12] F. Beyer and P. G. LeFloch, *Second-order hyperbolic Fuchsian systems. General theory*, ArXiv e-prints (April 2010), available at `1004.4885`.

[13] Florian Beyer and Philippe G. LeFloch, *Second-order hyperbolic Fuchsian systems and applications*, Classical Quantum Gravity **27** (2010), no. 24, 245012, 33. MR2739968 (2011h:35167)

[14] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, J. Isenberg, and V. Moncrief, *Topologically general U(1) symmetric vacuum space-times with AVTD behavior*, Nuovo Cimento Soc. Ital. Fis. B **119** (2004), no. 7-9, 625–638. MR2136898 (2006k:83043)

[15] Yvonne Foures (Choquet)-Bruhat, *Théorème d'existence pour certains systèmes d'équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires*, Acta Mathematica **88** (1952), 141–225.

[16] Piotr T. Chruściel, Gregory J. Galloway, and Daniel Pollack, *Mathematical general relativity: a sampler*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **47** (2010), no. 4, 567–638. MR2721040

[17] Piotr T. Chruściel, James Isenberg, and Vincent Moncrief, *Strong cosmic censorship in polarised Gowdy spacetimes*, Classical Quantum Gravity **7** (1990), no. 10, 1671–1680. MR1075858 (91i:83042)

[18] Clarissa M. Claudel and Kerri P. Newman, *The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear hyperbolic evolution problems with a singularity in the time*, R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. **454** (1998), no. 1972, 1073–1107. MR1631542 (99g:34126)

[19] T. Damour, M. Henneaux, A. D. Rendall, and M. Weaver, *Kasner-like behaviour for subcritical Einstein-matter systems*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **3** (2002), no. 6, 1049–1111. MR1957378 (2004g:83092)

[20] D. Eardley, E. Liang, and R. Sachs, *Velocity-dominated singularities in irrotational dust cosmologies*, J. Math. Phys. **13** (1972), 99–106.

[21] A. E. Fischer and V. Moncrief, *Hamiltonian reduction of Einstein's equations of general relativity*, Nuclear Phys. B Proc. Suppl. **57** (1997), 142–161. Constrained dynamics and quantum gravity 1996 (Santa Margherita Ligure). MR1480193 (99a:83005)

[22] Arthur E. Fischer and Vincent Moncrief, *Reducing Einstein's equations to an unconstrained Hamiltonian system on the cotangent bundle of Teichmüller space*, Physics on manifolds (Paris, 1992), 1994, pp. 111–151. MR1267072 (95a:58037)

[23] ———, *Hamiltonian reduction of Einstein's equations and the geometrization of three-manifolds*, International Conference on Differential Equations, Vol. 1, 2 (Berlin, 1999), 2000, pp. 279–282. MR1870137 (2002i:53051)

[24] ———, *The reduced Hamiltonian of general relativity and the σ-constant of conformal geometry*, Mathematical and quantum aspects of relativity and cosmology (Pythagoreon, 1998), 2000, pp. 70–101. MR1843034 (2002h:83010)

[25] ———, *The reduced Einstein equations and the conformal volume collapse of 3-manifolds*, Classical Quantum Gravity **18** (2001), no. 21, 4493–4515. MR1894914 (2003a:83008)

[26] ———, *Hamiltonian reduction and perturbations of continuously self-similar $(n+1)$-dimensional Einstein vacuum spacetimes*, Classical Quantum Gravity **19** (2002), no. 21, 5557–5589. MR1939933 (2003j:83012)

[27] Helmut Friedrich, *The conformal structure of Einstein's field equations*, Conformal groups and related symmetries: physical results and mathematical background (Clausthal-Zellerfeld, 1985), 1986, pp. 152–161. MR870220 (88b:83005)

[28] ———, *Conformal Einstein evolution*, The conformal structure of space-time, 2002, pp. 1–50. MR2007040 (2005b:83005)

[29] Carsten Gundlach and José M. Martín-García, *Well-posedness of formulations of the Einstein equations with dynamical lapse and shift conditions*, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006Jul), 024016.

[30] James Isenberg and Satyanad Kichenassamy, *Asymptotic behavior in polarized T^2-symmetric vacuum space-times*, J. Math. Phys. **40** (1999), no. 1, 340–352. MR1657863 (2000a:83042)

[31] James Isenberg and Vincent Moncrief, *Asymptotic behavior of the gravitational field and the nature of singularities in Gowdy spacetimes*, Ann. Physics **199** (1990), no. 1, 84–122. MR1048674 (91d:83007)

[32] Satyanad Kichenassamy and Alan D. Rendall, *Analytic description of singularities in Gowdy spacetimes*, Classical Quantum Gravity **15** (1998), no. 5, 1339–1355. MR1623091 (99d:83077)

[33] Richard P. A. C. Newman, *On the structure of conformal singularities in classical general relativity*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **443** (1993), no. 1919, 473–492. MR1252599 (94m:83041)

[34] ———, *On the structure of conformal singularities in classical general relativity. II. Evolution equations and a conjecture of K. P. Tod*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **443** (1993), no. 1919, 493–515. MR1252600 (94m:83042)

[35] Gerhard Rein, *Cosmological solutions of the Vlasov-Einstein system with spherical, plane, and hyperbolic symmetry*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **119** (1996), no. 4, 739–762. MR1362953 (96k:83012)

[36] Martin Reiris, *On the asymptotic spectrum of the reduced volume in cosmological solutions of the Einstein equations*, Gen. Relativity Gravitation **41** (2009), no. 5, 1083–1106. MR2506547 (2010e:83010)

[37] Alan D. Rendall, *Fuchsian analysis of singularities in Gowdy spacetimes beyond analyticity*, Classical Quantum Gravity **17** (2000), no. 16, 3305–3316. MR1779512 (2002e:83066)

[38] ———, *Theorems on existence and global dynamics for the Einstein equations*, Living Reviews in Relativity **8** (2005), no. 6.

[39] Hans Ringström, *The Bianchi IX attractor*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **2** (2001), no. 3, 405–500. MR1846852 (2002h:83075)

[40] ———, *Strong cosmic censorship in T^3-Gowdy spacetimes*, Ann. of Math. (2) **170** (2009), no. 3, 1181–1240. MR2600872 (2011d:83095)

[41] ———, *Cosmic censorship for gowdy spacetimes*, Living Reviews in Relativity **13** (2010), no. 2.

[42] Igor Rodnianski and Jared Speck, *Stable Big Bang formation in near-FLRW solutions to the Einstein-scalar field and Einstein-stiff fluid systems*, ArXiv e-prints (2014), 1–120.

[43] Richard Schoen and Shing Tung Yau, *On the proof of the positive mass conjecture in general relativity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **65** (1979), no. 1, 45–76. MR526976 (80j:83024)

[44] ———, *Proof of the positive mass theorem. II*, Comm. Math. Phys. **79** (1981), no. 2, 231–260. MR612249 (83i:83045)

[45] Arick Shao, *Breakdown criteria for nonvacuum Einstein equations*, 2010 (English). 2066657291; Shao, Arick; 520417454; Copyright ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing 2010; 9781124046952; 2010; 3410986; 66569; 50824791; English; M1: Ph.D.; M3: 3410986.

[46] Fredrik Ståhl, *Fuchsian analysis of $S^2 \times S^1$ and S^3 Gowdy spacetimes*, Classical Quantum Gravity **19** (2002), no. 17, 4483–4504. MR1926244 (2003j:83029)

[47] Michael E. Taylor, *Partial differential equations. III*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 117, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. Nonlinear equations, Corrected reprint of the 1996 original. MR1477408 (98k:35001)

[48] K. Paul Tod, *Isotropic singularities and the $\gamma = 2$ equation of state*, Classical Quantum Gravity **7** (1990), no. 1, L13–L16. MR1031097 (91b:83008)

[49] ———, *Isotropic singularities and the polytropic equation of state*, Classical Quantum Gravity **8** (1991), no. 4, L77–L82. MR1100116 (92j:83010)
[50] ———, *Isotropic cosmological singularities*, The conformal structure of space-time, 2002, pp. 123–134. MR2007045 (2004m:83063)
[51] J. Wainwright and G.F.R. Ellis, *Dynamical systems in cosmology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; New York, 1997.
[52] Robert M. Wald, *General relativity*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1984. MR757180 (86a:83001)
[53] Edward Witten, *A new proof of the positive energy theorem*, Comm. Math. Phys. **80** (1981), no. 3, 381–402. MR626707 (83e:83035)